LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

Eisenhower and Britain

R.P.D.

What of Our Independence?

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

The Miners' New Fight

ABE MOFFAT

December, 1952

One shilling and sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TERRIFYING GENERALS

Yank generals often give a moment's thought to the troops at this season of P——E and G—W—L*. Once there was Home-by-Christmas MacArthur (That 'Christmas' was 1950). Now there is Iron-man Eisenhower —the first man to win an election by promising to fly, but omitting to specify for what purpose. But the purpose was the same in each case—thinking up the 'stuff' to give the troops. To stiffen their limbs and to glaze their eyes. And to shake the enemy. I doubt whether these gold-braided figures terrify 'the enemy'; but many a conscript in Korea must exclaim: 'By G——! They terrify me!' echoing the British Iron-Duke, Wellington, of 150 years ago. The real truth, however, is that something is terrifying the Macs, the Ikes, their Hacks and Stackers. A *Meeting in Vienna* of the representatives of half the world's adult population will prove more potent than the meeting of the N.A.T.O. generals in Korea. But how is it that so many people in Britain and America remain confused, deceived, bewildered or bull-dozed? An American subscriber, writing in praise of a recent issue of *Labour Monthly*, says: 'So little along this line finds the eye of the average American today. Hearst and Winchell rule the news roost. American editors of progressive publications are thrown into gaol in the "best" tradition of Fascism'. And in this country? The British people need a true presentation of the facts and an indication of what they can do about them. They need to sharpen their craftsmen's tools, to replenish their mental weapons. It was well put by a Yorkshire reader a few days ago. He said: 'Please send specimen copies to these friends of mine. They are both Labour (Left) like myself, but just need *L.M.* to complete their armoury'. He, his two friends, and those like them are doing the most urgent job of all in sharpening their mental weapons.

Some weeks back an Essex reader asked: 'Can I buy *Labour Monthly Subscription Gift Tokens* again this year?' The answer to him and to all is: Yes. When we get your money, we send by return a Greetings card including a photograph of the editor, for you to forward to your friend, for whom we enter a 1953 subscription. The first copy reaches your friend on January 1; a good start to the New Year. It costs you : Half Year Token, 9s; One Year Token, 18s; Two Tokens, 35s; Three Tokens, 45s.

NEVER MIND HER BLACK LOOKS....

This is the time of year when many households go through upheavals of turning out old papers and magazines. However the lady of the house may glare, never throw away copies of Labour Monthly before the year 1950. For if you don't want them, we most certainly may. An example: some while ago we had a huge order for back numbers of the year 1948, because of a specialist interest in certain articles. This left our stocks very low of the months of June and October. Of course it is unusual for so recent an issue to be so much needed; but there is always a likelihood that we could use other back numbers. Offer them to us!

We have to decide soon how many sets of 1952 we must get bound. In recent years the demand has risen by nearly 50 per cent., as more people realise how essential it is for ready reference—and what a valuable investment. The earlier the orders, the earlier we can ensure delivery. The

* Deleted in deference to the N.A.T.O. Censor

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXIV, No. 12 CONTENTS December, 1952

Page

NOTES OF THE MONTH: Eisenhower and Britain, by R.P.D. 529

WHAT OF OUR INDEPENDENCE? by D. N. Pritt, Q.C. 541

THE MINERS' NEW FIGHT, by Abe Moffat 546

MEETING IN VIENNA, by Ivor Montagu 551

INDONESIA, by Arthur Clegg 556

THE ROSENBERG CASE, by 'Observer' 563

WHAT KENYATTA WROTE 562

DRAWINGS OF GREECE, by Paul Hogarth 552-553

Book Review: History of the Communist Party of the United States, by Wm. Z. Foster: *W. Gallacher* 569

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIV 573

Notes of the Month

Eisenhower and Britain

Americans have been for some time providing the European world with the proof that a bourgeois republic is a republic of capitalist business men in which politics are only a business deal like any other.

Engels, Letter to Sorge, December 31, 1892.

JUST sixty years have passed since Engels wrote the above words about the American 'bourgeois republic' and the character of American politics as 'a business deal' between 'capitalist business men'. The truth of this judgement has been demonstrated anew, on a magnified canvas, in the recent Presidential election, with the limitless expenditure of the big financial monopolies to get their man in, the barefaced electoral swindling and lying, the morass of corruption and charges of corruption, and all the rest of the familiar 'democratic' paraphernalia on a scale to make even the most hardened electoral machine managers in Western Europe raise their eyebrows. This time, however, the significance is wider than when Grover Cleveland was elected

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in 1892. It is a measure of the satellite situation of the rest of the diminished capitalist world in 1952 that the American Presidential election dwarfed local news to provincial proportions. The outcome of the election is universally recognised as of international significance. Twenty years ago the election of General Hindenburg as President of Germany was an ominous landmark of the transition from the Weimar era of social democratic deception to Hitler and to the second world war. Today the election of General Eisenhower as President of the United States characterises the transition from the twenty-year era of 'New Deal' 'Fair Deal' politics on the road to the new type of military fascism. The same giant American financial monopolies which backed and financed Hitler in Germany, to be the instrument of their anti-communist crusade, and which were then already and are even more so today closely interlocked with the German monopolists of the Ruhr, have now concentrated their forces to send General Eisenhower to the White House for the same basic aims.

A Red Light Warning

The significance of the outcome of the American Presidential election did not turn on any question of visible difference between the programmes and policies of the two candidates of the ruling official parties.

> With the change of a few words, Mr. Eisenhower could have made the speech made by Gov. Stevenson, and Gov. Stevenson could have made Mr. Eisenhower's speech.
>
> (*Wall Street Journal*, September 9, 1952).

> It would take a microscope to detect the differences between them.
>
> (*New York Journal of Commerce*, September 19, 1952).

The only representative of an alternative policy, for peace and the interests of the people, Vincent Hallinan, the candidate of the Progressive Party, was studiously kept hidden by the giant publicity machines from the view of the electorate; every measure was taken to endeavour to intimidate his supporters; and in many states the machinery of obstruction was utilised to deprive electors of the possibility of voting for him. The mass of the American electors, anxious for peace, hating the Korean war, fearful of the developing slump, could only search desperately to solve the insoluble enigma of discovering any reflection of their desires in the programmes of the two official candidates who stood equally for the policies of war and increasing the burdens

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the people. So far from the Democratic candidate representing a 'more liberal', 'progressive', 'enlightened' policy, his only majority votes came from the hard core of the old reactionary slave-owning states in the South, the seats of racial intolerance and obscurantism. Both parties were deeply steeped in racialism. Both were equally committed to the war policy. Thus, whatever, the outcome, the frustration of the will of the people was sufficiently guaranteed from the standpoint of finance-capital. But in this election the most powerful, reactionary and aggressive ruling forces of finance-capital, represented by the Rockefeller, Mellon, Morgan, Du Pont and kindred interests, that is, the principal war-profiteering interests, had combined to back General Eisenhower (81 per cent. of the press backed him) as the most suitable instrument for their purposes. In these circumstances, their success in securing his election (all the more, in view of his obvious incapacity as a candidate) represented a political success of the most reactionary, aggressive warmaking forces of American finance-capital.

Electors for Peace

'Why can't we have good times without wars?' In these terms a reporter of the Scripps-Howard chain summarised the outlook of the average American voter on the basis of a wide survey, presented under the title 'The American Voters Speak'. He found the Korean war the main issue in the voters' minds:

> Of all the current election issues the one that stirs the harshest expressions of anger against the Administration is the drafting of one's sons for the Korean war. . . .
>
> Almost without exception those who are angered over the drafting of their sons protest, 'I don't know what the Korean war is about', or that it is 'unnecessary' and 'bungled'.
>
> Some parents even feel that the Korean war is being kept going as an artificial means of maintaining prosperity and avoiding another depression.
>
> (*San Francisco News*, September 24, 1952).

He described the expression of a farmer in Iowa:

> Near Dyersville, Iowa, I called on George Recker, a prosperous farmer. Recker's oldest son, still in uniform, had just come home after being discharged from the Army. . . . The elder Recker was sitting on the porch alone. . . . Asked how he felt about the election, he replied angrily, 'It's all right having all this prosperity, but the price is too high'. . . .
>
> The boy had been in Korea. . . . 'For a time we didn't know whether he would walk again', interjected Mrs. Recker.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'My other boy has also been wounded', Recker stormed. 'It's not worth it. Why can't we have good times without wars? If this is the price we have to pay for prosperity, I'd rather have hard times'.

The reporter found the voters regarding the choice as 'a choice between war or depression', since Democratic Presidents were associated with two world wars and the Republicans under Hoover with the Great Depression. Such is the impression created by the Great American Miracle on its beneficiaries. It was under these circumstances that the Republican machine managers chose the issue of appearing to offer a quick end to the Korean war as the easiest sure-fire electoral swindle in order to remove the suspicions of Eisenhower-la-Guerre and romp home to victory. The classic example of the 1935 election in Britain was reproduced in a new form. The deep desire of the American people for peace was utilised in order to secure the victory of the plotters of war.

Political Prospects in the United States

The consequences of the election of Eisenhower as President are not only significant for the international scene, but also for the internal development in the United States. It has long been demonstrated in the modern era that the planners of an aggressive world war must first make war upon their own people, in order to seek to destroy the progressive movement and inculcate militarism and brutality. Such was the role of Hitler in Nazi Germany. A corresponding anti-democratic role is performed by the witch-hunt in America, and is carried a stage further by the victory of the Eisenhower-McCarthy gang. The election result is a direct blow to the organised labour movement of fifteen millions in the United States, whose leadership still followed the old tactics of playing the game of the two-party system of monopoly capital, and had combined for Stevenson against Eisenhower, especially on the issue of the Taft-Hartley Act. The result showed how impotent were these discredited and demoralising tactics to mobilise the working class.

Organised labour has never suffered so resounding a defeat as it did last Tuesday, and the whole question of its political activity would in any case have had to be reviewed to avoid such disasters in the future. . . . The candidate of labour suffered a disastrous defeat, and the majorities given to his opponent were nowhere greater than in those states where organised labour was supposed to be strongest. . . . Labour was split at the best about 60—40 in favour of Mr. Stevenson—not a result which can please the senior officials of the labour movement.

(*The Times*, November 12, 1952).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The outcome places sharply before the American working class and progressive movement the necessity of independent political activity.

Engels on American Labour

As Engels wrote long ago on the perspective of the American labour movement (using the term 'Schleswig-Holsteiners', which was Marx's favourite term for the slow-moving Anglo-Saxons):

> I think it will be the same with you in America too. . . . The Schleswig-Holsteiners and their descendents in England and America are not to be converted by lecturing, this pig-headed and conceited lot have got to experience it on their own bodies. And this they are doing more and more every year, but they are born conservatives—just *because* America is so purely bourgeois, so entirely without a feudal past and therefore proud of its purely bourgeois organisation—and so they will only get quit of the old traditional mental rubbish by practical experience. Hence the trade unions, etc., are the thing to begin with if there is to be a mass movement, and every further step must be forced upon them by a defeat. But once the first step beyond the bourgeois point of view has been taken things will move quickly, like everything in America, where, driven by natural necessity, the growing speed of the movement sets some requisite fire under the backsides of the Schleswig-Holstein Anglo-Saxons, who are usually so slow.
>
> (Engels, letter to Sorge, February 8, 1890).

The industrial battles of the working class, and the political fight for democracy and peace will sharpen in the United States against the Eisenhower regime.

Offensive of Reaction and War

The international significance of the return of General Eisenhower as President of the United States is manifest to all. It is reflected in the unmistakable note of alarm which has run through all comment in Britain, in the rest of Europe and in Asia, even beneath the official platitudes of welcome. Pleasure and hopefulness have been expressed only by the De Gaulles, the Chiang Kai-sheks and their like. The return of Eisenhower represents a high point in the world offensive of reaction and war. It is part of the same offensive which is expressed in the role of the Tory Government in Britain, the Pinay anti-communist drive in France, the fascism of Malan in South Africa, or the barbarous offensive against the people of Kenya. This is no contradiction to the rising strength of the camp of socialism, and of democracy and peace throughout the world. On the contrary, the increased

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violence of the offensive of reaction and war is the reflection of the fears entertained by the leaders of this camp as they see the balance of the world moving against them. But the return of Eisenhower is a warning signal to all. It is a warning signal of the reckless drive forward of the forces making for war. And it is not least a warning signal for Britain, that the pressure and offensive of the most ruthless and aggressive sections of American finance-capital will be intensified against Britain.

American Offensive on the British Empire

The no longer hidden conflict between American and British economic, commercial and strategic interests is manifesting itself more and more sharply every day. In the economic field the battle for export markets is in the open, with the American-financed monopolies of Western Germany and Japan as the main instruments of the offensive against Britain. The attack on the sterling bloc is pressed forward with the demand for convertibility. The Conference of Dominion Premiers, opening at the end of November, is likely to prove the scene, not merely of the play of contradictions between the rival interests within the Empire, but of the advancing American offensive. Canada at first showed reluctance to send more than an observer ('the conference is not regarded by the Government with ardent enthusiasm', *Manchester Guardian* Ottawa correspondent, August 5). Finally Canada consented to participate only on condition that the agenda should include a review of internal economic and social policies, i.e. facilitate the offensive on Britain's social services 'extravagance' and the standard of living of the people, as the supposed cause of the dollar deficit. The Australian Tory Premier, Menzies, preceded his prospective trip with a public hymn of praise to 'American imperialism':

> I become very resentful when I hear people affecting to sneer at American imperialism. The benevolent commands of a great nation should be good for mankind. If that is American imperialism, let us have more of it.

(Premier Menzies of Australia, *Christian Science Monitor*, September 24, 1952).

Over Imperial Preference, on which the angry comments of the Conservative Conference over G.A.T.T. were quoted last month, the American official press replied by threatening a 'head-on collision':

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A real crisis is developing in British-U.S. commercial relations. . . . Should Britain insist on complete freedom to increase preferences, there is no doubt that a head-on collision with the United States will be inevitable.

(*New York Times*, October 15, 1952).

Handing Over the Empire

Premier Churchill once on a historic occasion declared that he had not become Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. But that was eleven years ago. It referred to his previous Government. Today he presides over the surrender of Bermuda to the Americans. On November 9, just in time for the Lord Mayor's Banquet (but the topic was not included in Mr. Churchill's speech), the War Office announced the departure of the legions 'with regret':

The War Office announces with regret that in the present circumstances it is obliged to withdraw the British garrison from Bermuda. . . . A British garrison has been part of Bermuda life since the colony's earliest days. In 1951 the Royal Naval Dockyard here was closed.

(*The Times*, November 10, 1952).

Lest it might be thought that this policy of 'scuttle' represented a magnanimous concession to the demand of the people of Bermuda for independence, it should be explained that the British garrison has been withdrawn in order to leave the American military occupation in sole possession.

Colonial Loans Bill

No less significant was the Colonial Loans Bill introduced in parliament in November by the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Lyttelton—so bellicose, when dealing with Malayans or Africans, so obsequious when dealing with the American moneybags. The purpose of this measure is to enable the American-controlled 'International Bank' to invest dollars in the colonial empire. Mr. Lyttelton said:

We have neither available balances on international account nor the necessary volume of savings at home to finance all the projects which will be desirable.

He went on to explain apologetically that this was not really a question of selling out the colonies to America:

It was right that fears should be expressed about colonies borrowing from sources other than the mother country, and the British Government had to be sure that no interference with the administration of the colony was involved in such loans, and that they did not sell a colony's birthright for a loan.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Times City Editor commented:

> It now seems to be conceded that this country for the time being simply has not got the savings and export surplus to finance the colonies' development programme adequately, as it has done in the past. Such a deficiency is unpleasant to admit. But admitted it must be. And the admission is the more painful when the colonies, alone of all the groups of overseas countries, have continued to increase their sterling balances during the past few years. . . .
>
> But dollars are dollars. And the Government's view of the need for dollar lending to the colonies and thus to the sterling area in a general sense is evidently expressed in the Colonial Secretary's statement that 'you can hardly restore a healthy balance of payments between North America and the rest of the world solely in terms of current trade'.
>
> (*The Times*, November 15, 1952).

Thus not only have the hundreds of millions of pounds worth of dollar surplus arising from the sale of colonial products from the subject colonies been utilised to meet the dollar deficit of the United Kindom, leaving the colonies with frozen sterling balances (increased by nearly £600 million between the end of the war and June, 1952), which they are prevented from utilising to obtain dollar imports; but these subject colonies are now to be saddled with further dollar loans at 4½ per cent. in order to assist the dollar deficit of 'the sterling area in a general sense'. In this way the policy of intensified colonial exploitation, which has been the key policy of British imperialism to meet its crisis since the end of the war, is combined with selling out the colonies to the American financiers for dollars.

Rearmament and the American Rifle

Undoubtedly the conflict between the British and American rulers is becoming intensified also in the strategic sphere, and will be further intensified by the return of Eisenhower, with the active role of the Taft-Dulles advocates of extended aggression in Eastern Asia. This was the obvious significance of the special emphasis in Mr. Churchill's Guildhall speech on the necessity of ending the war in Korea. For months the American press has been reporting the desperate struggle of British military representatives against the crippling demands of the American overlords.

> Winston Churchill is challenging the whole American assumptions concerning the requirements for the defence of Europe. The British Prime Minister now insists that United States military men over-estimate the threat of Russia. The British Government would like to reduce its arms spending.
>
> (*U.S. News and World Report*, October 3, 1952).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the overriding power of the American warlords, so long as the present policy is followed by Britain, has been demonstrated once again in the ignominous surrender of Mr. Churchill and the British military representatives in the protracted controversy over the rifle, and the abandonment of the British projected .280 rifle for the American .300 rifle.

> The .280 rifle, with which it was hoped to rearm the British soldier and the infantry of other N.A.T.O. countries, is practically dead. . . . The British authorities still maintain that there is no other rifle of the same type comparable with it. There appears, it is said, no alternative but to accept the new American .300 rifle. . . .
>
> Such a development would hardly be surprising in view of the inconclusive results of Mr. Churchill's representations on this matter during his visit to the United States last January. . . . If we are to accept such a course, it would appear reasonable to expect, in return for abandonment of the .280, assistance in re-equipping our forces with the American pattern.
>
> (*Daily Telegraph*, November 15, 1952).

In other words, surrender—in the hope of dollars.

Toryism and the Nation

It can be no pleasure to the Churchills, Lytteltons and associated representatives of British finance-capital to have to bow down and grovel in this way before the American *parvenus*, and to yield step by step their hold upon the Empire. The feelings of the Conservative Conference were unmistakable. The so-called 'anti-Americanism' (i.e. resentment of American intervention and domination) is not confined to the labour movement. It is a national phenomenon. But modern Toryism, expressing the politics of a ruling class in decay, is incapable of reflecting the national feelings of the British people. Munich and Neville Chamberlain already demonstrated that; and it is being demonstrated in a deepened form today. The upper class rulers of Britain, tied in an unhappy coalition of dependence on the American rulers, and deeply conscious of the real antagonism of interests, try in their fashion, within the limits imposed by the premises of their own policy, to struggle and manoeuvre inside the toils of the American net. But they are unable, from the nature of their monopolist class interests, to lead a serious struggle of the nation for independence.

Responsibility of the Left

For such a struggle would require a complete reversal of policy. It would require the building of close relations with the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new rising world of socialism and peace, in order to counterbalance the weight of the capitalist Old World of America. It would require a new policy in relation to the peoples of the Empire, replacing the methods of domination by the recognition of full national independence, and so establishing a new basis for co-operation. Above all, such a struggle for national independence could only be based on the full support and active role of the working masses of the British people; and these dominant rulers, like the Pétains and Weygands of old in France, fear their own working masses, and the menace of the loss of their own privileges, more than they fear the subjection of their country to the domination of a reactionary foreign power. Hence the decisive responsibility of the labour movement to lead the national struggle of the British people, which unites with the struggle for peace and for better living conditions. But this responsibility can only be fulfilled if the key battle now in progress within the labour movement, the battle being waged by the leftward moving membership of the trade unions, the co-operatives and the Labour Party, together with the Communist Party, for a new progressive policy is carried through to a victorious conclusion.

Offensive against the People

There is no room for easy-going illusions of an automatic advance of the left, as the crisis deepens. On the contrary, it is necessary to recognise that at the present moment there is taking place a very active offensive from the side of the Government, the employers and the right wing leadership, all the more intensified because opposition and militancy is developing in the labour movement and in the feelings of the people. The representatives of reaction are determined to get their blows in first, while the left is still at a relatively early stage of wider mass development and is still thrashing out policy and programme. As the counterpart of the return of Eisenhower in America may be observed in Britain the pointer of the recent by-elections at Cleveland and Wycombe, where a Tory Government was able to perform the unprecedented feat, after a year of attacks on the standards of the people, of actually increasing its proportion of the vote—a sufficient indication of the price of right wing leadership and policy in the labour movement, since the by-elections were fought on the basis of the official right wing policy. Within the Parliamentary Labour Party discipline has been tightened against any

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form of dissident opinion or expression. Within the trade unions the same offensive is revealed in the attack on the London Trades Council. In the field of industry the flat rejection by the Porter tribunal of the miners' demand for increased wages has not only demonstrated the price of the system of compulsory arbitration imposed by right wing policy (the engineers, who, after a similar flat rejection, at any rate threatened action by a ban on overtime, thereupon got a small increase—but minute, because of the immediate retreat from the threat of action); it is the pointer to the future aim of directly cutting wages. This has already been demonstrated in Malaya with the ruthless cut imposed on the starvation wages of the rubber plantation workers. Never was it more necessary for trade unionists in Britain to understand how closely their conditions are bound up with the conditions and struggle of the colonial workers and peasants. The offensive against the Malayan people and against the people of Kenya is one with the offensive against the British people. It is conducted by a common enemy. It requires to be met by a common and united resistance.

Mr. Butler and Mr. Attlee

Especially ominous in its menace was Mr. Butler's speech in the economic debate in parliament on November 11. On the one hand, he indicated that the already colossal arms expenditure ('the greatest single item of expenditure is the defence programme, with the accompanying civil defence and other expenditure related to the main programme') would be further increased by supplementary estimates. On the other hand, he proclaimed the aim of cutting civilian expenditure in order to ease the burden of taxation on the employers, and therefore demanded that we must 'brace ourselves to accept the need for further sacrifices'. He praised the instrument of 'monetary policy', i.e., higher interest rates, as the most effective means to 'counter inflation', i.e., cut standards. He warned against increasing production for home needs, when the aim must be to cut costs for the sharpening battle in the restricted export market permitted by the American bans. He held out the threat of convertibility. He added that he would always seek to protect 'our social democracy' (which has now become a Conservative slogan). In short, a speech full of menace of a general economic offensive. Mr. Attlee, bold leader of the Opposition, replied by declaring that the speech

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a mass of 'platitudes'. He added that 'if we had to retrench today and have lower standards, many things ought to go before we touched the welfare state' ('don't throw me into the briar patch'). Such is the 'leadership' offered by the right wing for the protection of the working class and the people in face of this offensive.

No Time to Lose

Against this offensive it is necessary to organise the full strength and action of all the fighting forces of the labour movement and of the supporters of independence and peace. The new currents of militant stirring are manifest and growing; but the weakness of the left as an organised force still needs to be frankly recognised and even emphasised. That weakness lies both in the field of policy and in the lack of unity. The struggle is conducted in separate compartments; in industry and the trade unions; in the divisional labour parties; and in the Parliamentary Labour Party; and on top of this, there is the hampering effect of the denial of democratic rights in the working class mass organisations, and the ban on association with the Communist Party and other left organisations. Politically, the same weakness is expressed in the lack of a common immediate programme, and the extreme variety of voices and outlook apparent among the critics of the right wing policy. Criticism of Tory and right wing policy, or of dependence on the American monopolists, can only become effective when it is accompanied by a clear and consistent alternative programme capable of winning majority support. Hence the paramount need today is to develop and organise close co-operation and common action, on the basis of a common immediate programme, of all those who recognise the seriousness of the present position, and who are determined to defeat the economic offensive and war offensive of Toryism and the right wing leadership, and to go forward to a new policy corresponding to the interests of the British people.

November 17, 1952. R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; $3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada ($3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT OF OUR INDEPENDENCE?

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

BOTH here and abroad, many people find it difficult to understand why the virtual destruction of British Independence during the last seven years has excited so little opposition among its British victims. It is important to study the reasons for this, for our future depends on a proper understanding of the facts, of the role of the two main political parties in the betrayal, and of the consequences which it entails for all of us.

That our independence is in great part destroyed for the moment is plain. For example, if any war to which the U.S.A. is a party breaks out, as many powerful Eisenhower-pushers desire and intend, the most vital of our sovereign rights, i.e., the most important item of our independence—the right to decide whether to remain neutral or to join in on one side or the other—will not exist. The matter has plainly been decided for us already, by Washington, with the complicity of the former Labour government and of the Tory Party. If such a war starts before the British people have turned out the Tories and drastically altered the Labour Party, we shall be in that war from the start, on the wrong side.

Many other elements of independence and sovereignty are in abeyance, too. Britain cannot decide with whom she will trade, or with whom she will be allied, whether her shipbuilders may deliver to foreign buyers ships with which the government has pledged itself not to interfere, how much she will spend on armaments, or on health and houses, what films or 'literature' or tobacco she will import, or how she will equip or drill her troops. Like Turkey and China of the capitulations era, she is not even allowed jurisdiction over crimes committed in her own territories, if the perpetrators are members of the occupying military forces. Her foreign policy, and therewith the essence of her home policy, are decided in Washington, and it is not inappropriate, symbolically, that the ostensible head of her government, who looks so thoroughly English, is in fact half American.

How have we lost our independence? How have so many of us been led to accept it? How quickly, and in what way, is opposition growing?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We began to lose our independence to the power-drunk and war-enriched rulers of America, shortly after the Second World War ended. The loss began from the cutting-off of lease-lend; it was continued by the American loan and its strings, and has developed progressively since, through Marshall 'aid' and other stages, with their hawsers. We did not need to sacrifice it. If in 1945-6 we had had a genuine socialist government, it would have rallied us to a forward policy, and we would have set our teeth against temporary hardship, gained the moral and political leadership of Western Europe and the friendship of all Europe and most of the rest of the world, and started on an era of co-operation and prosperity, in which the Americans would have been 'reduced'—in reality exalted—to co-operation instead of war-mongering domination. But we had no such government; the great popular Labour victory had been 'rewarded'—in reality betrayed—by a right-wing government which immediately and naturally adopted the Tory foreign policy of hostility to the new socialist world and 'co-operation' with the U.S.A. This policy inevitably involved that, for the time being, we would become increasingly a political vassal or 'client state' of the U.S.A., and that the conduct and even the ownership of our industry would pass more and more into American hands.

How was the public persuaded to accept that policy? After all, it was not only against the interests of nearly all of us, and against the wishes of nearly as many, in the then mood of admiration and affection for the Soviet Union; it was fatal to any hope of winning the socialist advance for which we had just voted, for you cannot get nearer to socialism by putting your head in the mouth of the big capitalist lion.

To get that policy accepted called for the most astute and conscienceless operation of the party system and of 'democracy'. Democracy, truly operated, would involve accepting and carrying out the people's will. In a capitalist Britain, with the power of industry and finance left intact, and political office under the party system switching from Tory to Social-Democrat, 'democracy' means that the ruling class first decides what to do—with an eye, of course, on how much it can bamboozle the public into swallowing, as the Hoare-Laval fiasco illustrated—and then decides how to delude the public, with the help of the press and other media of publicity, into accepting it. It was clear that the Social-Democrat surrender to Toryism and the parallel general

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surrender to the American ruling class, presented an occasion of crucial importance and delicacy for the bamboozlers. The very last thing the electors could be told was the plain truth about what was happening. The pride of the British people, their love of independence, their resentment at being ordered about from outside, their already fairly well-developed antagonism to the ruling class of America, had all to be carefully damped down or deflected, lest the whole plot should fail. The Labour government was able to rest on the support of traditional working-class loyalty, even whilst it carried on the Tory pro-American and anti-socialist foreign policy. This it did so well that neither the Tory Party nor the Tory press had any serious misgivings; and, with even the traditional mock-battles of the party system in abeyance, and the Tory Party ready if necessary to support it against its own members, the government was able to achieve the miracle. It loaded us with chains and taught us to hug them as if they were the means and symbols of prosperity—even, according to Morgan Phillips, of socialism! The two parties, between them, fooled most of the people for quite a lot of the time, and the price we have paid for it is not only the loss of our independence, the general mess in Western Europe, and the danger of war, but also the degeneration of our political system and temporary confusion and frustration in the ranks of the Labour Party.

That is how we lost our independence, and how for the time we swallowed the loss. But how far are we still accepting it, and in what form is opposition developing?

The consequences of the betrayal are more than enough to make anyone revolt who realises the facts and observes the causes. We grow poorer every day. International tensions increase, and the danger of war is damped down only by the admirable forbearance of the U.S.S.R., by the growing World Peace Movement, and by the difficulties felt by America as to where to start war without taking suicidal risks. Our foreign trade is hamstrung by the Truman curtain, and German and Japanese competitors, owned or financed by America, damage it still further. Our colonies are being economically surrendered to America.

Our young men are conscripted for two long years and trained in arms to fight America's wars and our own colonial wars—this is called 'fighting for freedom'—and they leave their parents and wives and children inadequately housed and fed because the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national resources are bled white to provide the arms the young men don't want to bear. The worst war-criminal elements of Western Germany are picked out of prison with a view to helping America to fight the Soviet Union—with full liberty to the Germans, as once before, to turn round and fight the West instead, if the barbarians who are to lead them think that that is a better bargain. We are threatened with slump, unemployment, hardship and misery, instead of being rewarded with the prosperity and peace we deserve and could so easily win. There is, in truth, no field of activity in which we are not in full contradiction and conflict with the U.S.A., and yet in every field we are chained to them, to our disaster, to the disaster of the American people, and to the swelling profit of the big American tycoons! Even British ruling-class skill in bamboozlement cannot maintain such a position for long, and it is easy to see that opposition is growing.

The opposition grows of course unequally in different soils. The general public is developing a feeling of opposition which will soon be of the greatest value, but it would be too optimistic to think of this as already consciously directed to the real causes of the trouble. The general public resents the hardships, the restrictions, the approaching slump, the international tensions, the Korean and Malayan wars; but it does not yet clearly resent—because it does not yet fully understand—the policy of subjection and surrender to the U.S.A. and of anti-Soviet hysteria which causes the troubles; it hates the results but does not yet see and hate the causes. True, it is developing a strong instinctive feeling against United States' intervention in British affairs, which will become fully effective when it is more fully reasoned and is directed against the bull's eye of the rulers of America; but it has not yet seen deeper into the roots.

In particular questions, where their own commercial or financial interests are affected, British capitalist leaders themselves have moved towards the stage of making protests against U.S. inroads. That the door of Anzus should be shut in their face was a public humiliation which, partly because of its publicity, even this vassal cabinet found it hard to stomach. But these first feeble reactions are apparently much weaker than the feeling developing in the rank-and-file of even the Tory Party as was startlingly shown in the case of Lord Hinchingbrooke where the Dorset Tories in their meeting unhesitatingly turned down their own Executive Committee which had stood by the war-mongers of the cabinet

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and attempted to get rid of Hinchingbrooke. If this is the case inside the Tory Party, how much stronger is the feeling outside it.

It is clear that feeling against American domination is growing everywhere in the capitalist camp. It is seen in France and in other N.A.T.O. satellites of the U.S.A.; and here in Britain it is growing from month to month and almost from week to week, until the overlords in Wall Street and Washington are themselves discussing openly what is to be done about this upsurge of 'nationalist sentiment' amongst 'the natives' of this island. It is growing into the anger of a whole people against outside interference and domination.

And the sharp edge of that feeling is already being turned also against those who brought them into this pretty pass. It is precisely the Right Wing leaders of the Labour Party who are being discredited in the eyes of the people; and justly so, for it is they who for six long years were most identified with this glorification of United States' imperialism. They tried to present this strong-hold of robber capitalism as something utterly benevolent, as almost socialist. As the people of Britain see through these pretences, the labour Right Wing which fathered them inevitably incurs increasing unpopularity. Hence the crisis amongst the Right Wing leaders of the Labour Party, their frenzied activities against all the Left, their fatuous and plaintive appeals to the pirates of Wall Street to assume the saintly pose in which they had pictured them to the British people.

Meantime within the labour movement as a whole the fight of the Left is growing. In the workshops and in the homes the exhortations of Right Wing leaders are falling upon deaf ears. They call upon the working class for 'willingness to make sacrifices', and the answer of the advanced workers comes more and more clearly: 'Why should we make sacrifices on the altar of American imperialism'? 'Why should our sons be slain between the horns of that altar'? The fight to maintain the standard of life is more and more clearly in opposition to the Right Wing's pro-American policy: and so with every other aspect of the fight. More, it is in full accord with the instinct of the people as a whole, as it begins to take shape as a struggle for national independence and for world peace.

It is this fight of the Left Wing within the workshops, the unions, the co-operatives, that is becoming the key to the situation, the key that can unlock the prison bars of dollar imperialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For if this fight is concentrated and clarified in its aims, it will seek to win the whole labour movement for its standpoint as the clear alternative to the submission and surrender policy of the Right Wing.

The struggle within the labour movement can transform more than the labour movement. The more influence is won through struggle inside the ranks of the labour movement, the greater the influence outside. As the working class is won over to the fight to get rid of American domination and of the party leaders who have been the channels of that domination, so the whole people can be won. For this key struggle awakens all sections of the nation to the fight for independence and for the right of the British people to determine their own destiny.

THE MINERS' NEW FIGHT

ABE MOFFAT

IN 1951 the British miners demanded an increase in wages of £1 per week for all mineworkers, and following their Annual Conference that year opened up negotiations which resulted in an increase of 13s. 6d. per week for underground and 11s. 6d. per week for surface workers. This agreement in November 1951 provided a guaranteed minimum weekly wage of £7 0s. 6d. for underground and £6 1s. 6d. for surface workers, providing the miner worked every shift within the normal five days. If he loses one shift within the five he suffers the loss of two days' pay.

The British miners were in no way satisfied with this increase and when the Tory Government decided to reduce the food subsidies, with a consequent lowering of the standard of living of the miners and all other workers, the National Union of Mineworkers at a special conference in March 1952 unanimously passed a resolution calling for increased wages and compensation benefits and protesting against the anti-working-class budget of the Tory Chancellor. Whether right wing trade union leaders like it or not, this indicates a desire on the part of the N.U.M. to use the industrial machine to influence and reject an anti-working-class policy of the Tory Government.

Immediately following this conference the British miners began to show what they meant by 'a substantial increase in wages' and at their annual conference in July 1952 they decided unani-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mously (both right and left wing) to submit a claim for an increase in wages of 30s. per week for all mineworkers. Not for a number of years had such unity been witnessed in a conference on a demand for a wage increase.

The President of the N.U.M., Sir William Lawther, in support of the claim, subsequently declared that the miners were serious in their demands and that the miners, if they cared, could 'bring down the whole caboodle'.

In the negotiations, however, and at the hearing before the Tribunal, it became quite clear that the National Coal Board were supporting Government policy and they even used the statements of the members of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress in their attempt to show why the miners should not be granted a wage increase. Thus the decision of the T.U.C. at Margate in relation to wages in no way strengthened the miners' claim, but had quite the opposite effect. The other resolution on wages which was defeated at the T.U.C., although receiving 2,600,000 votes, would have given much more support to the miners' demands, since their wages claim was not based solely on the increase in the cost of living. In fact, many other trade unions could not understand why the Miners' Union voted for a resolution confining wage claims to the rise in the cost of living while the miners themselves were demanding an increase of 30s. per week. I am quite confident, however, that if the British miners in the pits had had the opportunity to decide which resolution they would support there is no doubt as to how they would have voted because, as Sir William Lawther declared, the miners are serious about their claim for a 30s. per week wage increase.

It is true that the increased cost of living is one of the factors on which the miners base their claim, but there are others. The problem of manpower for the mining industry has not been solved, and can only be solved providing the miners receive adequate wages. Some people are jubilant over the fact that in 1952 manpower has gone up by 20,000, making a total manpower of 720,000, but this is far below the pre-war manpower and is still lower than even the 1948 manpower, when we had 726,000. In that year a target of 750,000 was set, but was never reached. Certain members of the Coal Board and the Government thought then that they had overcome the manpower difficulty and they commenced a campaign about 'getting tough' with the miners, saying that no more concessions could be granted. This policy resulted in a downward trend in manpower, which at the end

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 1951 went below the 700,000 mark, and despite the increase of 20,000 this year, if reforms are rejected by the Coal Board and the Government we shall doubtless again see a decline in manpower which will be far more costly to the country than would be the granting of the miners' wage claim. It should be understood by all that this great basic industry requires a minimum manpower of 750,000 and that this can be obtained only by the granting of the increased wages necessary to attract manpower to the mining industry.

The opponents of the miners' claim contend that increased wages can be got only if the miners increase output. Since 1947, however, output has increased from 197 million tons to 211 million tons in 1951. Output per manshift in 1951 was the highest in history and 13 per cent. more than in 1947. If the two factors of the increased cost of living and increased output were taken into account in determining wages, then—based on the £5 15s. minimum weekly wage in 1947—the underground worker should now have at least a guaranteed minimum wage of £8 12s. 6d. per week. In fact, at the moment he has £7 0s. 6d. as a guaranteed minimum weekly wage, and even the addition of the 30s. per week claimed would not give a wage commensurate with the increase in the cost of living and increased output.

Another factor to be taken into consideration is the heavy sacrifice made by the miners in loss of life and limb, which cannot be compensated for in money and is certainly not repaid on the present level of wages. In 1951 500 were killed, 223,000 injured and 800 died from pneumoconiosis, while 4,000 new cases of this terrible and deadly disease were registered. These lives are far more valuable than all the millions of pounds spent in the mining industry and the miners rightly declare that men and boys who are prepared to enter this dangerous and dirty occupation are entitled to a standard of wages second to no one in the country, including the members of the Coal Board.

Despite this strong case submitted by the N.U.M., the Coal Board's reply, like that of the Engineering and Shipbuilding Employers, was a blank refusal. This is the first time since 1926 that a miners' claim has been completely rejected in national negotiations.

At least the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, by the threat of some form of action, have compelled the employers and the Government to retreat and propose a small increase in wages for the engineering and shipbuilding workers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The miners, on the other hand, are compelled by the conciliation machinery to go to the Tribunal when deadlock is reached in the negotiations between the Union and the Board, and the decision of the Tribunal is binding on both sides. The recent decision of the Tribunal, therefore, may compel the miners to reconsider this conciliation machinery, and to seek a change in it to provide that when deadlock is reached between the Union and the Coal Board the dispute may be referred back to the membership for consideration before going to the Tribunal.

The Tribunal on this occasion has completely rejected the miners' claim and the miners are not only indignant but are preparing their forces to continue the fight for increased wages and better conditions. It is ridiculous to expect miners to continue working organised overtime under the Extended Hours Agreement when they find that the earnings from this overtime are used against them in negotiations as an argument in support of the refusal to grant an increase.

It is not surprising that immediately following the Award, the Special Conference held on 7th November should decide to pursue a modified claim for wage increases, along with a number of other demands, as follows:—(1) abolition of the bonus shift; (2) adult wages at 18 years of age; and (3) speeding up of negotiations on a new wages structure. The standstill order for piece rates will end on 22nd November, 1952, and this will permit negotiations on price lists to take place again at colliery level. No doubt the miners will take full advantage of the termination of this standstill agreement on piece rates. It is quite evident from the important decisions taken that the fight is not ended by the Tribunal's Award, but rather that a new fight for wage increases for miners is beginning.

In 1950 the miners received from the Tribunal a miserable award of an increase of 5s. per week, but within a period of two months the Coal Board and the Union had to open up negotiations at the request of the Government and negotiate a further increase for the miners. By united activity now the British miners can compel the Government and the Coal Board to take a more reasonable attitude in relation to miners' wages and can strengthen the whole fight against the Tory Government and reaction.

The same applies to the fight against wage restraint. In 1948 the National Union of Mineworkers voted in favour of wage restraint,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but in 1950, following pressure and a vote of the Areas, the miners decided against wage restraint and this decision was instrumental in changing the policy of the Trades Union Congress. I am sure that what the British miners were not prepared to accept under a Labour Government they will refuse to accept under a government of the Tories, the arch-enemies of the miners. Lord Leathers has stated that he wants an increase of 5 million tons of coal in 1952, and a further increase of 10 million tons in 1953, but this will not be obtained without miners and it will certainly not be produced on the basis of the present wage standard.

Mr. Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer, stated in the House of Commons recently that he hoped the miners would understand how we all appreciated their efforts. The miners, in my opinion, do not want the applause of Mr. Butler and his Government, who are attacking the living standards of the working class and protecting and securing the highest profits in history on behalf of their own class. What the miners want is hard cash and the 30s. increase, so that their wives and families may have a decent standard of living.

The miners want many other improvements. They want a better pension, such as the officials and members of the Coal Board have. They want increased payment to redundant miners, just as the ex-coalowners and officials received huge sums of money for loss of office. They want injured miners to receive higher rates of compensation when off work due to accident. They want the miners to be treated as officials and members of the Board are, so that when they are off work due to sickness they will not suffer a reduction in their wages. They also want East-West trade and more nationalisation, as was decided at their Annual Conference and at the T.U.C.

Above all they want to restore the seven-hour day, which was stolen from them by a Tory Government in 1926, and I am confident that the vast majority of the miners believe that the best way to achieve these aims is to develop all forms of united activity in support of the wage increase and the other reforms agreed to by the N.U.M.

In carrying out this policy they will be playing a real part in saving Britain and the British working class and joining hands with all other Trade Unions to bring about the early defeat of the present Tory Government and to replace it by a Government pledged to fight for a real working-class policy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MEETING IN VIENNA

IVOR MONTAGU

WHO is for peace? Who, rather, is not for peace? The forces of peace are strong. They are growing as numberless as the sands of the sea.

Six hundred and ten millions have signed the demand for a Pact of Peace. More than half the adult population of the world. But how many millions yet have registered the demand without signing? The trade union conferences, the co-operative congresses, the gatherings of students, intellectuals, all sorts. And how many millions more have registered the dumb wish for it, as the terror of G.I. or F.B.I. has held apart signatory or collector?

The forces of peace are strong. The world movement for peace is the greatest, the most all-pervading movement achieved in human history, wider far than the United Nations—for it includes the voice of nations blocked from entering the United Nations, and the voice of the colonial and repressed.

The forces of peace are strong. But a brief space ago, the ideas of peace were held queer, unnecessary, the jeremiah notions of a sect, treason to this or that. What are these ideas, hammered out in give-and-take and growing understanding by day and night in vast congresses?

One: stop the wars in progress—in Korea, Viet Nam, Malaya. Stop fighting, then argue the settlement. And on the only basis that can be lasting. Out with foreign troops, foreign interference. Settlement by the people themselves;

Two: no remilitarisation of Germany. Unification of the country by withdrawal of troops and methods freely discussed and decided by the German people themselves;

Three: no remilitarisation of Japan. End to foreign occupation and foreign bases;

Four: thoroughgoing reduction of armaments, absolute abolition of weapons of mass destruction, under strict control, operative in every country, no exceptions;

Five: definition of aggression, the rule of law, not of *ad hoc* tailored majorities deciding anything goes according to their patron's whim. Ban on the use of armed force by any nation on the territory of any other under any pretext;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drawings of Greece . . . . by Pau

General Sarafis—former Republican officer and supporter of Venizelos—was an uncompromising opponent of the reactionary regime of the pre-war monarchy and the Metaxas dictatorship. Was Commander-in-Chief of E.L.A.S., Greek army of National Liberation. Recently returned from four years in exile. Prominently associated with E.D.A., the Greek Democratic Alliance.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hogarth

A common sight in Athens. The wife of an unemployed worker sells matches, fruit or cigarettes to buy a little food for the family.

Paul Hogarth visited Greece during the summer. The originals of these drawings and many others, including the trial of Greek democratic leaders, can be seen at the Galerie Appollinaire, Litchfield Street, Charing Cross Road, London, from December 1st—13th.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Six: outlawing of propaganda favouring war—no more an interference with freedom of speech than the banning, in every civilised country, of propaganda for the drug traffic and the white slave trade;

Seven: recognition and realisation, of the right of every people to independence and sovereign nationality, to the disposal of its own resources, its own territory, its own fate;

Eight: peaceful co-existence of differing systems, respect to the right of every nation to its own chosen way of life;

Nine: no discriminatory trade blockade and vetoes, normalisation of economic exchange, free cultural exchange between all nations on a basis of reciprocity and mutual respect;

Ten: and above all: settlement by negotiation between the Five Great Powers of all the issues between them.

Who is there, today, of any class, any party, in any country, of either sex, any age, whose heart would not leap if there came news of agreement on such a programme?

The forces of peace are strong. Not only is there the Soviet Union, thirty-five years old land of price cuts and prosperity, nature subdued and the spirit exalted, calm nerves and wise heads. Not only are there the Peoples' Democracies, lands of promise where once were sinks of corruption. Not only many-millioned Peoples' China, land already of infinite power, goodness and happiness. But allies mount daily among the workers of the great industrial, imperial countries. Sacrifice, frustration—these are poor reasons to hide a blazing truth. Allies mount every hour among the whole peoples submerged in the colonial system. Their hate of those who pillage their resources, in the name of development, extract huge profits, in the name of freedom of opportunity, and treat them like dirt, in the name of national leadership, seethes and bubbles over. Where in all Asia, all Africa, all South America could Churchill or Attlee, Truman of Eisenhower, travel and find affection?

The forces of peace are strong. *But this is precisely coupled with the fact that the danger of war has increased.*

The game of death and domination is dying. Life is winning. The authority that remains to the powers of cruelty and privilege is brief. In terms of historic epochs, swift doom now stares them in the face. What will they not do in their desperation?

This double aspect of progress emerges clearly from the United States' election. The danger of war is increased by the election

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the American Hindenburg. With behind him a little Hitler as Vice-President. A single heart-beat, the Americans say, stands between Nixon of the Unamerican Activities Committee, Nixon the hero who halted Hiss—and the Presidency. (Were I Eisenhower, remembering that hundred million dollar fund for, among other things, assassination and poisoning, and the sort that control it, I should not sleep easily). Why did he win? Because of the all-pervading sentiment, the universal sigh, diagnosed as obtaining in all countries (America no exception) by Ehrenburg in his speech to the World Peace Council in Berlin: 'It can't go on'. (Do not the American commentators, blind to its full implications, themselves diagnose: 'Time for a change'?)

The role of Eisenhower's promise to 'bring the boys back from Korea' cannot be overestimated. And if he tries to discharge his promise by the roundabout route of a holocaust that will many times multiply the millions who have already found their U.N. protection in the grave? Life itself is heaping the containment theories of Mr. 'X' Kennan and Mr. H. Truman in the dustbin. The grass is thrusting the flagstones asunder. And the would-be containers threaten to pervert the very desire for a change into a change for the worse.

Here is the background of Vienna. Vienna is no parade. No mere muster of peace ranks. It will show a mere glimpse, like the eighth of the iceberg that shows above water. Vienna is an important act. 'How can the war going on be stopped? How can the cold war be brought to an end? How can the independence of nations be safeguarded and the security of every country guaranteed?' Not only peace 'partisans' ask these questions. They rise to the lips of every man and woman. In calling on all people—whether hitherto active for peace or not—to come and discuss them at a Congress of Peoples for Peace, Professor Joliot-Curie and the World Peace Council are taking a step that corresponds to everyone's need, and everyone's wish. When Transport House pundits or any others exhort their faithful to boycott, they seek simply to castrate their flock, to turn them from the whole reason for which they ever joined a union, paid a party fee, were born or breathed. They will but make their feet as wet as King Canute's. The trivial threats of decomposing men, the barriers of the occupation bullies, the terrors of the F.B.I., geographical distances—the worst all these can do will not prevent all eyes, all hearts, all hopes lighting on those who are meeting in Vienna.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INDONESIA

ARTHUR CLEGG

SOFTLY, softly move the dancers, telling in rhythmic motion the half-remembered tales of struggles long ago. Whether they come from Java, Bali or Sumatra or the Celebes, the classical grace of hand and arm and foot bespeaks one of the world's great arts. Thinking of the dancers, again so recently here, one remembers the time when they came first to a London which knew nothing of Hitler's bombers and whose young men, like those of Indonesia, were as yet untouched by Japanese methods of war and imprisonment. They gave their art on that first occasion for a political purpose dear to the Indonesian people: they were raising money to help the Chinese in their struggle against Japanese aggression. Since Indonesia was then a colony of the Dutch they gave their art, the finest of the few possessions which they still controlled themselves, in order to help a fellow Asian people.

This autumn, at the great Asian and Pacific Peace Conference in Peking, other representatives of the Indonesian people expressed in still clearer terms the desire of Indonesia for the peace and independence of all Asian peoples. They welcomed not only the third anniversary of the People's Republic of China which their dancers, in small measure, in London in 1938, were helping to build, but affirmed the desire of the Indonesian people that the peoples of Malaya, of Vietnam, of Korea and of Japan itself may live their lives in peace and freedom too.

Indonesian dancers came again to Britain in 1946. Again they danced for a political purpose. They were from the Perhimpoenan Indonesia, the Indonesian Association in Holland. Many of them had participated in the Dutch resistance to Nazi occupation, risking their lives and enduring concentration camps along with their Dutch comrades. But now their call was *Merdeka* (freedom) for Indonesia.

It was about this time that Mr. John Coast, who has now published a book (*), became interested in Indonesia. Later in 1946 he joined the Far Eastern section of the British Foreign Office, was transferred to the British Embassy in Bangkok, and in February, 1948, resigning from the Foreign Office, went as an

**Recruit to Revolution, Adventure and Politics in Indonesia* (Christophers, 308 pp., 18s.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adviser to the Indonesian Republican Government in Jogjakarta. Since, as he now reveals, after reaching Jogjakarta he wrote a report on what he had learned to the head of his former department in the Foreign Office: maintained throughout a close acquaintance with a member of the British Embassy in Bangkok, and on his return to London reported to the Foreign Office, one cannot say that he had severed all connections with his former employers. But as he was in a position to know at least something about the diplomatic events concerning Indonesia in those years it is worth examining what he has to say, putting on one side for the moment both his flattery of the fascist-minded Hatta and his revelations about his own and Kingsley Martin's affability to Pibul Songgram of Siam, the 'Franco of the Far East'.

The first point is that he cannot but admit the friendly and helpful attitude of the Soviet Government in every crisis which confronted the young Indonesian Republic in those crucial years. In 1948 the Indonesian Republican Government mistakenly felt compelled by Anglo-American-Dutch war against it to sign the Renville Agreement which, in addition to placing restrictions on the Republic, was so ambiguous as to mean almost anything the Dutch Government wished it to mean. For over two years, off and on, British and Dutch troops had fought the Indonesians (British troops gaining the bases and covering the landing of the Dutch forces), while both used American Lease-Lend weapons from which all the Americans asked was that American markings be removed.

The Republic stood isolated and its progressive Government under Premier Sjarifuddin was jockeyed out of office by cowardly and reactionary men, giving place to that of the servile Hatta. The Dutch Army, encouraged by these events, prepared another attack. Mr. Coast writes:

> Just when political negotiations under Hatta's leadership seemed to have reached deadlock, at a period when the United States was showing no signs of clear policy in Indonesia, and when Britain was glad to be rid of her old responsibility,

Suripno, the Indonesian representative in Prague, and the Soviet Consul there,

> simultaneously announced that the U.S.S.R. and the Republic of Indonesia had made a diplomatic agreement. The effect was tremendous ...At that juncture it had to be admitted that any powerful friends were welcome. (p. 103)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Later, at the end of that year, when the position of the Republic was even more parlous, Mr. Coast records an approach from the Soviet Embassy in Bangkok to open up trade with Indonesia and break the Dutch blockade. This was, he admits,

> Hugely important to the Republican Government...No other foreign power, not even India, had felt herself strong enough or free enough to make such a positive gesture of real assistance. (p. 210)

And finally, in the United Nations discussion at the very end of 1948 which helped to compel the Dutch to end their third offensive against the Republic it was, he records, 'the Russian resolution' which 'was morally the soundest and the best'. (p. 225)

Both from what Mr. Coast writes, and from what is implied in what he writes, it is clear that the Soviet Union, alone among the large Powers stood steadfastly in support of the Republic, and moreover, by its attitude, played an enormous part in compelling other Governments to change theirs.

In the House of Commons on November 23, 1945, a point which Mr. Coast does not relate, Mr. Bevin, Foreign Minister, had defined the British Government's position:

> It is quite clear that H.M. Government have a definite agreement with them (the Dutch authorities) to provide for the Dutch Netherlands Indies Government to resume as rapidly as practicable full responsibility for the administration of the Netherlands Indian territories.

In 1948, however, the British representative had to vote with other members of the Security Council for a halt to the Dutch offensive. The Soviet steadfastness played a not inconsiderable part in that change of front.

Mr. Coast also throws a little light on the internal affairs of the Indonesian Republic. In September, 1948, occurred the tragic fighting at Madiun when the leaders of the Communist Party of Indonesia—Sjarifuddin, Setiadjit, Darousman, Suripno and others—were seized at the orders of the Hatta Government and imprisoned. Before the end of the year they had been murdered in circumstances which point to the complicity of Hatta and his clique. Mr. Coast, in his book, adds not very much to knowledge of these events, though it is very revealing of his own position in that he does not even mention this murder of the men he had once claimed as his friends. But one point he makes unmistakably clear, that the Hatta Government attacked the Communists, trying to create a civil war:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Since the situation in Solo was clearly the most dangerous, the Government had declared that, as from 17th September, it was in a state of military emergency...At the same time the excellently disciplined, and incidentally the most loyal (*sic*) Republican members of the famed Siliwangi (West Java) Division, were sent to Solo to carry out cleaning up operations. The Government's moves threw the Communists into confusion...Eventually they decided to hoist the flag of rebellion in Madiun on the 18th. (p. 194-5)

Mr. Coast does not add, as well he might, that for weeks beforehand, the Hatta Government had been dismissing from the Army the most loyal Republican officers, that is the Communist officers and those who supported them; for months it had been imposing restrictions on the trade unions, which were the most vigorous supporters of the Republic; and that its order on September 17 to disarm the Communist-led regiments came at a time when everyone knew that another Dutch offensive was just ahead. Naturally the Communists opposed this fatal weakening of the Republic before the coming Dutch attack. The pitiful conclusion of Madiun was the abject surrender of the Hatta Government to Dutch troops in Jogjakarta on December 19, 1948, on the very first day of the renewal of the Dutch offensive. Only the guerrillas, frequently still Communist-led, kept the Republic alive.

If Mr. Coast almost ignores the main forces inside which created and maintained the Republic, he also ignores those who supported it outside. The Australian Waterside Workers Union, which boycotted all Dutch shipping for months, one of the longest and most effective boycotts in history, is dismissed in a line; the heroic actions of the Singapore dockers are entirely omitted; so are those of the Ceylonese dockers and the New Zealanders and of our own British sailors of the *Moreton Bay*, who refused to carry arms for the Dutch. Nor does he mention the events in China which so helped Indonesia. The Chinese people, led by the Communist Party, resisting the re-imposition of Chiang's dictatorship in 1946, caused masses of American wartime equipment to be diverted from the Dutch in Indonesia to China. By the spring of 1947, signs of Chiang's defeat were already clear, throwing the American government into a panic and making it more afraid to back the equally tottering regime of the Dutch in Indonesia.

Mr. Coast properly sneers at the warmongers of the Dutch Catholic Party, clamouring persistently for the destruction of the Indonesian Republic. But he has no word of praise for those progressive Dutchmen who went to prison rather than bear arms

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the Indonesians. In Britain he mentions only a handful of Labour Party M.P.s and the Union of Democratic Control as helping the Republic, just as though the Communist Party had not led the way in November, 1945, and before with its clear call of 'Hands Off Indonesia', paving the way for the Labour M.P.s who were persuaded—and it needed some persuasion—to take the matter of Indonesia up in Parliament in December that year.

Of Mr. Coast's account of a telephone conversation with myself I will only say that its accuracy can be judged from the fact that the article which he states I had written in mid-January, 1949, had appeared in the *Daily Worker* on December 2, 1948, in warning of the disaster to which the Hatta Government was heading. The article used no jargon but stated plainly the positions both of Mr. Hatta and Mr. Coast.

Mr. Coast ends his book with the conclusion of the Netherlands-Indonesian Union Agreement negotiated by Hatta in 1949. This gave partial legal recognition to the Republic. That, he claims, following Hatta, was *Merdeka*. Yet in 1951, while the Republic was beset by the economic difficulties resulting from American war policies, foreign firms in Indonesia made more profit than at any time in history. And the American Government was seeking then, and still is, to use the Republic's economic difficulties to reduce it to a new colonial dependence and drag it into American war plans. The Australian Government, sharing air bases with Britain in Malaya and controlling them in New Guinea, equally seeks the subjection of Indonesia. And, most menacing of all, Japanese militarists, encouraged by America, are looking once more to the time when Indonesia will again be the raw materials base for their revived armaments industry, dominated by them and American big business. *Merdeka* has not yet been won. It has still to be struggled for by all Indonesian patriots together. For example, lack of independence and of will to independence has so far prevented Indonesia from opening full diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and China and taking advantage of Soviet trade offers oft repeated since 1948, despite the need of Indonesia for such trade.

This year the formation of the Wilopo Cabinet to replace the fascist-inclined Sukiman Cabinet which fell when it tried to drag Indonesia into the American war plans through the so-called Mutual Security Agency, held out the promise of a more democratic regime in Indonesia and the opening of full diplomatic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and trade relations with the Soviet Union and China. Therefore, in the debate in the Indonesian parliament in June, the Indonesian Communist Party decided to give the Wilopo Cabinet an 'opportuntiy to work' and voted in its support.

Since then, the new Government has neither released the imprisoned trade union and democratic leaders nor purged the Army of the reactionary officers who have been planning a pro-Anglo-American military coup, nor got rid of the British military mission. It has signed a small trade agreement with Hungary but done nothing on the greater question of opening full diplomatic and trade relations with China and the Soviet Union.

While it has avoided entanglements in the American Pacific War Pact, American pressure on Indonesia, especially through the Philippines, has not ceased. The hesitancy of the Wilopo Government in taking an openly democratic line has increased and not diminished Indonesia's problems. The Indonesian people demand that their government play a wholehearted part in the struggle for Asian and world peace and freedom, for only in a free and peaceful Asia can Merdeka for Indonesia be firmly grounded. Especially they demand the end of the war in Korea, which threatens all Asia.

The success of the Asian and Pacific Peace Conference in Peking and the fulfilment of its decisions are therefore of the utmost importance to Indonesia. Then the struggles and heroism of Sjarifuddin, whom Wilopo knew so well, of Setiadjit, Darousman, Suripno and a host of others who died that Indonesia might be free will be remembered in dances of surpassing beauty which will be danced, not by nobles, but by the common people of Indonesia.

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL: *To non-European countries (including Hongkong) except as below, post free: Single copy 4s. 6d.; a year's subscription 54s.*

To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy 5s.; a year's subscription 60s. To Aden, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq and Syria, post free, 4s. per copy; a year's subscription 48s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 19 YEARS AGO

WHAT KENYATTA WROTE

[In place of the customary extract from 25 years ago we print this month an extract from an article which J. Kenyatta, at present charged with conspiracy in Kenya, wrote for this magazine in the November number of 1933. Mr. Kenyatta was at that time Secretary of the Kikuyu Central Association which was subsequently proscribed by the government.—Ed. L.M.]

In the last 35 years the British imperialists have robbed all the best lands from the African natives of Kenya. The pastoral and agricultural Africans, entirely dependent on their land as the basis of their entire life have largely found themselves landless. Uncompensated appropriation of native lands has rendered thousands of the Africans homeless, and often, where once they cultivated the soil or herded their cattle on land immemorially associated with the life of their family, they now find themselves serfs forced to work on their own lands for the benefit of the white 'owners' and even in some circumstances to work without pay or food.

The soul of the African is stricken nigh to death by confiscation of its ancestral lands, the obstruction of its free development in social and economic matters, and its subjugation to an imperialist system of slavery, taxpaying, pass-carrying and forced labour. This policy of British imperialist robbery and oppression aroused the greatest alarm and anxiety amongst the Kenya Africans, the outcome of which was the revolt in 1922, when defenceless Africans—men, women and children—were shot down by these filibusters. . . .

Perhaps many will ask: 'What can we do against an imperialist government which is armed with machine guns, aeroplanes and bombs, etc.?' My answer to that is, we have learnt examples from other countries. And the only way out is the mass organisation of workers and peasants of various tribes, and by having this unity we shall be in a position to put up a strong protest against this robbery and exploitation.

Therefore, all Kenya Africans must fight for their liberation. We cannot forget how we have been exploited and oppressed through these 'solemn pledges'. Let none of our countrymen have any faith in these imperialist hypocritical 'promises' which mean nothing but the oppression and exploitation of the masses. In this fight we shall have the support of all who are oppressed by the British Slave Empire—the Indians, the Irish, the South Africans—all these people are revolting against this damnable Empire whose days are numbered.

With the support of all revolutionary workers and peasants we must redouble our efforts to break the bonds that bind us. We must refuse to give any support to the British imperialists either by paying taxes or obeying any of their slave laws! We can fight in unity with the workers and toilers of the whole world, and for a Free Africa.

From *The Gold Rush in Kenya*, by J. Kenyatta, November, 1933.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ROSENBERG CASE

'OBSERVER'

PUBLIC opinion in more continents than one has been deeply disturbed by the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, who have now been lying under sentence of death for nearly two years. They were convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York on a charge of conspiracy; the essence of the charge being that they conspired to obtain by espionage information about the atom bomb and other U.S. military secrets for the benefit of the U.S.S.R. The period covered by the charge was June, 1944, to June, 1950, during which period the U.S.S.R. was not, of course, in a state of war against the U.S.A., and was indeed fighting on the same side as the U.S.A. during the most important part of the period. A determined effort has been in progress to obtain a new trial; or, at worst, to secure a commutation of the death penalty.

What does an examination of the trial record show in the light of normal Anglo-Saxon legal traditions and procedure?

The indictment on which Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were tried was returned on January 31, 1951, against five defendants in all—the two Rosenbergs, one Morton Sobell, one Yakovlev and one David Greenglass. David Greenglass pleaded guilty. The two Rosenbergs and Sobell pleaded not guilty and were tried together, the case of Yakovlev being severed. The charge was that the five defendants named, together with one Harry Gold, one Ruth Greenglass 'and other persons unknown' had conspired over a period of six years, from June 6, 1944, to June 16, 1950, 'the U.S.A. being then and there at war, with intent and reason to believe that it would be used to the advantage of a foreign nation, to wit the U.S.S.R., to communicate, deliver and transmit to a foreign government, to wit the U.S.S.R., and representatives and agents thereof, directly and indirectly, documents, writings, sketches, notes and information relating to the National Defense of the U.S.A.'

It is in general easier to secure a conviction for conspiracy than for any other offence, for less has actually to be proved against the defendants; and prejudice or excitement may lead a jury to convict parties on a mere allegation that they agreed or arranged together to do something, under circumstances where,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if it were necessary to prove some positive criminal act, the jury would have to acquit because there would be no evidence at all of any such acts. To secure a conviction is moreover made easier still by the operation of a peculiar rule of evidence: that in a conspiracy case, so long as some evidence—however tenuous—is given from which an agreement between the alleged conspirators might be inferred, the acts and words of any of them, are admissible evidence against all the others. It is little wonder, in the circumstances, that in all periods of tension, in all countries, charges of conspiracy have been frequently made, and many defendants been been found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment, although little has been proved against them and no other crime could plausibly even be charged. The dangers inherent in conspiracy charges that convictions may be reached on inadequate evidence are indeed so well recognised that the rule has been firmly established in most Anglo-Saxon jurisdictions, including that of the Federal Courts of the U.S.A., that 'overt acts' demonstrating the conspiracy should be alleged in the indictment and proved. Such overt acts are normally alleged pretty specifically, so that the defendants can really know what case they have to meet—and indeed, also, that the public may know the nature and weight of the case. But here there are alleged twelve not very informative overt acts. Moreover these overt acts of an alleged six years' conspiracy are confined to only seven months (June 6, 1944, to January 14, 1945).

The trial took place before Judge Irving R. Kaufman on fourteen days in March, 1951. The prosecution put in a list of 112 witnesses, but in fact called only twenty-two of them, and one other. The strength and weakness of the case depends, of course, on these witnesses, on their characters, on what they said, who they were and what motives or interest they had; and it is thus of the greatest importance to know clearly all these points and to see exactly

(1) what sort of a reliable case all the witnesses between them were able to build up to establish that the Rosenbergs were guilty at all; and

(2) how serious anything was that the Rosenbergs were alleged to have done—and, above all, of course, whether what they had done merited the death penalty.

I turn at once to the evidence, adding only that as I am dealing with the cases of the Rosenbergs, I will pay little attention to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evidence which implicated any other persons, including Sobell, the only other person actually on trial with them.

The principal witness against the Rosenbergs was David Greenglass. There was an unsually large number of reasons for mistrusting his evidence. To begin with, he had pleaded guilty to the conspiracy for which the Rosenbergs were being tried, but had not yet been brought up for sentence; thus, he might hope—and he expressly said that he did hope—to obtain some advantage for himself as a result of giving evidence against the Rosenbergs; for the Court might ultimately give him a light sentence, and even if it gave him a substantial one, the Government might well remit much or all of it. This provides so terrible an incentive for lying, and so great a danger of convictions on untrustworthy evidence, that in practically all cases of 'accomplice' witnesses, of those 'turning Queen's evidence', the danger is minimised either by giving the accomplice a free pardon before he gives evidence or by sentencing him before he does so; and even then the need for corroboration of his evidence by independent witnesses, free from the taint of complicity, is always emphasised. As an accomplice witness, David Greenglass was in the worst possible position; he had been neither pardoned nor sentenced, and he knew that so soon as the cases of the Rosenbergs and of Sobell had been disposed of he would come up for sentence.

Moreover, such witnesses are universally regarded as highly unreliable, not merely because they are self-confessed criminals, and claiming to be betraying their associates, but far more because it is dangerously easy for them to implicate falsely, for some benefit to themselves, or to pay off some 'score', or for any other reason one who in fact took no part in the crime. They are in a position to tell a story that is in the main true, and thus much easier to tell without being exposed as a liar in cross-examination, but at the same time to insert into that story one limited but serious falsity, namely the assertion that some accused person took part in it when in fact he had nothing to do with it, and, if anything could make this easier, it would be that the accused was related to the accomplice, so that it would be natural for them to meet from time to time. To the peculiarities of David Greenglass as a witness in this case, it has to be added that Ethel Rosenberg, whom he was thus pushing towards a sentence of death, was his own elder sister who had always befriended

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and helped him; and Julius Rosenberg who he was treating in the same way was her husband and thus his brother-in-law. It was also clear, if not perhaps very important, that there had been long disagreements between him and Julius Rosenberg over a business in which they were partners after his demobilisation from the army, which eventuated in his instructing his lawyer to bring civil proceedings against Julius.) Nor was that quite all; for Ruth Greenglass, named in the indictment as a party to the conspiracy, for some unstated reason not actually indicted, but standing in peril of being indicted at some subsequent time, was David's wife, and he professed to love her dearly. This did not prevent him, in the course of the many interviews he had with the F.B.I. (Federal Bureau of Investigation), in which he told bit by bit, as he remembered it, the whole of his story, betraying *in the very first interview* the full tale of his own wife's participation in the conspiracy in which he himself, at any rate, was taking part. With such an equipment, David Greenglass might be regarded as a man on whose evidence it would not be safe to convict anyone, but his evidence must, of course, be examined.

His version of how he came to take part in the conspiracy was that his wife went down from New York to the neighbourhood of Los Alamos, where he was working as a machinist, to take him a message—as she alleged—from Julius Rosenberg, inviting him to take part in espionage, and that by the morning of the following day he had decided to do so! And, at a later stage, when according to him Julius Rosenberg warned him that he was in danger of arrest and ought to leave the country, he accepted from Rosenberg sums amounting to $5,000 in cash to enable him to do so; he stated on oath that he never had any intention of leaving, and that he concealed this intention from Rosenberg but nevertheless accepted and retained the money. He had, he added, such a distaste for the money that he wanted to flush it down the lavatory, but changed his mind and used it to hire Mr. O. John Rogge as his lawyer instead. The nature of his evidence against the Rosenbergs lent itself to no sort or kind of corroboration. It consisted of accounts of alleged conversations with them, at which no third party was present, and of occasions on which he said that he furnished to the Rosenbergs sketches and written descriptions of processes and material objects such as lenses. None of the alleged sketches or descriptions was produced, but Greenglass prepared — four or five years after the alleged incidents, from his own unaided memory—what he said

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were reproductions of the material, and these were put before the jury. Whether his limited education made it possible for him to do anything of this sort accurately, is a matter for scientists* rather than lawyers; but from the point of view of a lawyer it can be said that such reproductions, even from the most reliable of witnesses, would add little or nothing to their evidence and could not in any way constitute corroboration.

Not one word of his story against them was corroborated by anybody but his wife, nor by any circumstance or material object. A conviction based upon such evidence from such sources, without independent corroboration, cannot be regarded as reliable and should not be sustained. That not merely a conviction, but a sentence of death, should be based upon such evidence runs counter to all normal standards of criminal procedure and of the administration of justice.

The Rosenbergs, who at every stage asserted their innocence, gave evidence; they were, of course, submitted to cross-examination and answering fully and consistently everything that was alleged against them. Nothing was established against their character, unless it be that they had talked of the Soviet economic system, had thought that the Soviet Union was at one stage bearing the brunt of the Second World War, and had had in their possession a collecting box for Spanish refugee children.

I must say a little about the conduct of the trial. The prosecution, both in the opening statement of the prosecuting attorney and throughout the evidence, repeatedly made play with the alleged Communist connections of the Rosenbergs; the usual 'warning' was given that, of course, communism is no evidence of conspiracy or of espionage and was immediately nullified by the assertion—wholly unproved—that Communists are more likely to commit espionage than other people. The atmosphere of the case was indeed such that the mere suspicion of communist affiliation was almost enough of itself to make conviction certain.

From a purely English point of view, it is noticeable that the trial judge at times treated the defence counsel with considerable abruptness and discourtesy, and at almost all stages of the cross-examination of the main prosecution witnesses was harrying them to cut short their cross-examination.

* Dr. Harold C. Urey (an expert whom the prosecution promised to call upon, but did not) was quoted by the *New York Times* in 1946 as saying: 'Detailed data on the atomic bomb . . . . would require 80 or 90 volumes of close print which only a scientist or engineer would be able to read. . . . Any spies capable of picking up this information will get information more rapidly by staying at home and working in their own laboratories'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The last and most serious comment concerns the observations of the judge when passing sentence. Having regard to what little evidence of any kind had been given against the Rosenbergs, it is very shocking to a lawyer brought up under the Anglo-Saxon system, in which judges would deal with what is proved in evidence and nothing else, to read some of the statements made by the judge when passing sentence, presumably by way of expressing his reasons for deciding to impose the death sentence instead of a sentence of imprisonment. He made extravagant anti-Russian and anti-Communist comments; in short, he said the sort of things that one is accustomed to read in the more irresponsible newspapers, things which some of the less thoughtful readers may be led to believe. He went on to treat the case as if the information which the Rosenbergs were said to have communicated to the U.S.S.R.—of the value of which, as I have already mentioned, there was no real evidence—had been established to be of the most fundamental importance. He began, for example, with the assertion that what the Rosenbergs had done 'has already caused, in my opinion, the Communist aggression in Korea' (about which, of course, there was once again no evidence). He went even further and based his determination on sentence on the wholly unproved assumption that the Rosenbergs had obtained from David Greenglass and given to the U.S.S.R. just the vital information that enabled that country to develop the atom bomb which it could not have achieved without that information. The Rosenbergs had thus, as he put it 'altered the history of the world' to the injury of the U.S.A.

I am forced to the conclusion that, even if the conviction of the Rosenbergs had rested on reliable evidence that they had conspired to obtain some information, any sentence expressed by the judge to be based on such inaccurate and unproved assertions as to the importance of the information would have to be set aside on appeal under any procedure which provided for a free review of the sentence by an Appelate Court. Unfortunately, the procedure applicable to this case does not provide for such a review. Nor is there, in effect, any appeal at all to any court from either of the two main defects of this trial, namely, the unreliability of the evidence and the gravely excessive sentence. The duty of securing a review on these points thus rests on public opinion throughout the world.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

HISTORY OF THE C.P.U.S.A.

History of the Communist Party of the United States, by Wm. Z. Foster. (600 pp. International Publishers, New York; Collet's, London. 48/-).

THOSE who have read Marx on 'The Civil War in America', or the letters to Sorge by Marx and Engels will appreciate what Foster has to say about their keen interest in American affairs in his *History of the Communist Party of the United States*. There are many lessons in this great book which I hope will reach out to, and be taken to heart by active members of the Labour Party and members of the Communist Party.

It is pathetic to hear such wretched creatures like Messrs. Morgan Phillips and Noel Baker spout out nauseating twaddle about 'progressive capitalism' in America. They are only now repeating what the petty-bourgeois leaders of the Socialist Party of America were trying to put across before the First World War. In the 1912 election Roosevelt, not Franklyn D., but he of the 'big stick', came out with his 'Square Deal' programme. 'Walling for example, . . . said that "Certainly the socialist platform did not go any further than Roosevelt's unqualified phrase that 'the people' should control industry collectively." Both the Socialists and the LaFollette progressives complained that Roosevelt stole their thunder'. (Page 119). How easily were these timid petty-bourgeois place-hunters captivated by a phrase. With the rapid industrialisation that followed the Civil War, American capitalism made great advances. It had many advantages all of which are brought out very clearly in this history. But this advance enabled it to make considerable concessions to a limited section of the workers, while ruthlessly exploiting and brutally bludgeoning the unorganised masses. Gunmen and thugs, whole armies of them, were used for this purpose. 'Progressive capitalism'. Its history is red with the blood of the martyred working class. The American Federation of Labor (A.F. of L.) had no interest whatever in these unorganised masses. Theirs was a close corporation of craft unions, most of which, not all, were prepared to take full advantage of their less fortunate brothers. The leadership of the A.F. of L. is riddled with graft and corruption, the top leaders having salaries that place them in the same social class as ordinary millionaires. This corruption of the A.F. of L. leaders and their opposition to any effort to organise the great masses of workers in the big monopoly undertakings led to the formation of various forms of dual unionism. Outstanding amongst these was the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.) The militancy of this union under the leadership of Big Bill Haywood and our own George Hardy, played a great part in preparing the way for the great union organising that was to come later on. It took the form of the Committee for Industrial Organisation (C.I.O.) The original committee was composed of representatives of the coal-miners, textile, ladies' garment, men's clothing, printing, oil-field, cap and millinery, and metal miners unions. Terrific mass strikes all over the United States prompted the action of these unions. But the A.F. of L. leaders, Green, Wall and Co., who had used every means to sabotage and wreck the strike organisations, now took action

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against these unions and expelled them from the A.F. of L. One million members thrown out. It shows the length to which trade union agents of the imperialists will go. John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, and Sydney Hillman were amongst the principal leaders of the new movement. They gave a warm welcome to the Communists who were indefatigable workers. The service our comrades gave in the building of the C.I.O. was one of the greatest factors in its success. When Lewis resigned the presidency, Philip Murray succeeded him. The reason for Lewis resigning was really ludicrous. He supported Willkie against Roosevelt in the 1940 election and declared that if Willkie wasn't elected he'd resign as president of the C.I.O.; which he accordingly did on Willkie's defeat.

For several years the relations between the C.I.O. and the Communist Party were good. Murray and Carey played at being progressive. Carey even went as a member of a C.I.O. delegation to the Soviet Union and came back with a very fine report particularly of the great part the Soviet trade unions were contributing to the building of the new society. Following the Second World War the C.I.O. joined up in the World Federation of Trade Unions. The A.F. of L. kept out and from the start set itself the task of disrupting this world-wide organisation of the workers. With the passing of the Taft-Hartley Act and the intensification of the witch-hunt Murray and Carey ratted and went swinging over to the right. Then following the example of the A.F. of L., with the same gangster methods, they expelled seven progressive unions and used the full power of the machine, to browbeat and crush any attempt at criticism. An appalling story that—of Murray and Carey—but all too common in the corrupt atmosphere of Yankee capitalism. Murray is head of the steel-workers union in Pittsburgh, but neither he nor any of his associates on the Executive are, or ever were, steelworkers. They have been able, at any rate until recently, to keep any actual steelworker off the leading committee of the steel workers' unions. Following the sharpening of the American drive into Europe the C.I.O. representative Carey and the British representative Deakin walked out of the World Federation and under the guidance and leadership of the A.F. of L. set up what they are pleased to call the International of 'Free' trade unions.

The American capitalists through the Marshall Plan, have got control of Britain and Western Europe. 'Toe the line, or we stop supplies' is their attitude towards these satellites. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the leaders of the A.F. of L., having spent millions of dollars corrupting trade union leaders in Western Europe in an attempt to disrupt the progressive union, should, at a recent meeting of the 'Free?' trade unions, reply to a complaint from the Belgians, 'Shut your gob' (to use Lawther's inelegant expression) 'or we stop supplies'. Deakin would be present at that meeting and would sit entranced listening to Mr. Green and when his chance came at the Labour Party Conference, up he jumped, and with typical Yankee presumption ordered the delegates to 'Toe the line or——'.

Through all the terrific struggles of the American workers the Communists gave loyal assistance and suffered more than their share of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hard knocks. In the building of the party many serious obstacles had to be overcome. Sectarianism and opportunism as a carry-over from the earlier socialist parties and continual vicious attacks from the government. De Leonism, as expressed through the S.L.P. (Socialist Labor Party) created a school of sectarians who seriously handicapped the political development of the American workers. Equally harmful has been the demagogic opportunism of the petty-bourgeois leaders of the Socialist Party of America. Foster traces in a masterly way the effect of these tendencies in the general movement and particularly in the earlier years of the Communist Party. For attacks from the government consider this:

> This growing employers offensive hit the Communist Parties (there were in the early stages two parties) with full force in the infamous Palmer raids at the end of 1919.
>
> On October 16th of that year the police pushed into the C.L.P. (Communist Labor Party) headquarters in Cleveland and arrested the Party leadership, and on November 8th in New York, 700 police invaded mass meetings celebrating the anniversary of the Russian Revolution, seizing several hundred workers. But these raids were only dress rehearsals for the big outrages yet to come. Suddenly during the night of January 2nd, 1920, the department of Justice struck nationally, in 70 cities, dragging workers from their homes, slugging them and throwing them into crowded gaols, often without proper food and toilet facilities. (Pages 174-5)

That's just a sample of what goes on in the land of 'Progressive Capitalism'.

This conception of Progressive Capitalism appeared in another form under Lovestone—he espoused the theory of 'American Exceptionalism'. It was a different kind of capitalism, free from slumps and crises. He was expelled from the party in 1929 and is now the complete renegade. In 1929 American capitalism plunged into an economic crisis that shook and shattered capitalism throughout the world. But despite this lesson Browder succeeded in winning the majority of the party to a new form of Exceptionalism. In Britain we got very little information about the actual theory Browder was putting forward. The Teheran agreement had put an end to class war. Henceforth workers and capitalists would join hands and march along together in never-ending harmony. He had proposals for expanding the capitalist market. 'I am quite willing', he said, 'to help the free enterpriser to realise the forty-billion dollar market that is required entirely and completely by their own methods' (page 423). Then intelligent capitalists would double the wages of the workers. By these means, markets and doubled wages, crises would be eliminated. 'If', he declared in a speech at Bridgeport, Connecticut, on December 12, 1943, 'J. P. Morgan supports this (pro-Teheran) coalition and goes down the line for it, I as a communist am prepared to clasp his hand on that and join with him to realise it'. (Page 424)

Foster, himself, strongly opposed this line of Browder's that led to a temporary liquidation of the party. This section is worth special study in view of the treacherous role of Tito and the corruption of the Yugoslav Communist Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An outstanding part of the History is the gradual development within the party of a full understanding of Marxism-Leninism in relation to the negro question. Many weaknesses in connection with this all-important problem for the American people had to be overcome within the party and Foster follows them through in really fine style and reaches this conclusion:

> Socialism in the United States will wipe out the monstrous Jim Crow system. The Negro people, for the first time will enjoy the dignity and happiness of full equality in every sense of the word; economic, political, social. (Page 567).

In the meantime the heavy battle for negro rights goes on. More and more the negro people assert themselves and strike back at the various forms of white supremacy. In all these struggles the Communist Party participates. And then the great campaign for the Peace and the scathing exposure of the Wall Street warmongers and its 'Executive Committee' (as Marx named the government of the United States) and in particular the party's exposure of the crimes being perpetrated in Korea. All this has brought a new wave of hatred against the Communist Party. So once again it is ferociously attacked by the whole power of the capitalist state. Foster completely smashes the allegations of 'conspiracy' and 'violence'. Here is a very fine passage:

> The fundamental difference between the Communists and the Right Wing Social Democracy (and its Browderite variant) is not that the Social Democrats want to establish socialism by peaceful means and the Communists want to achieve it by violence. Instead the difference is that everywhere the Social Democrats have abandoned Socialism altogether and are committed to an indefinite perpetuation of the capitalism system; whereas, the Communists have shown conclusively that, in line with the democratic will and interests of the workers they are the ones that are resolutely leading the peoples of the world to socialism.

The danger of war is great, the onslaught on the party, rather the terror directed against it, is terrific, but Foster has no doubt of the outcome. He refers to the great brother parties in the Soviet Union, China, Czechoslovakia, Poland and elsewhere and concludes his History with:

> The Communist Party in the United States works and grows in the spirit of these Communist Parties. It knows that, living up to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, it will one day lead the American working class and the nation, even as it is now the best representative of their interests. Nor can all the power of arrogant capitalist reaction balk the C.P.U.S.A. from fulfilling this historic role. (Page 572).

As I opened, so I close. I hope all active members of the Labour Party and all members of the Communist Party will read this latest splendid work of our good comrade, William Z. Foster.

WILLIAM GALLACHER.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Index to Volume XXXIV

I—AUTHORS

		Page
ABBAS, AHMAD K.	'Mother China' (I) and (II)	75, 131
ALLEY, REWI	The Accused (Poem)	432
ARNOT, R. PAGE	The War in Malaya	33
	David Ricardo (Review Article)	278
BELFRAGE, CEDRIC	A Witch-hunt Victim	135
BERNAL, J. D., F.R.S.,	Leonardo Da Vinci	170
BOSE, D. K.	Indian Elections	117
BOUGHTON, RUTLAND	Music (Review)	476
BRIGHT, RICHARD	Whose Crisis?	127
BURNS, ELINOR	The Co-ops (Review)	91
B.M.B.	Shorter Notices: Russia, Disarmament	95, 191
	Shorter Notices: East of Stettin-Trieste, Free Press	430, 480
R.R.B.	The Coup D'Etat in Egypt	418
CARRERAS, ROBERT	Truman's Point IV	81
CHINNERY, JOHN	Chinese Books (Review)	240
CHITTAPRASAD	Lino-Cut	216-217
CLEGG, ARTHUR	Plotting War on China	122
	Indonesia	556
COMERFORD, GEORGE	The Miners' Fight	275
CORRESPONDENT, A	Trial in Jordan	315
DAVIDSON, JAMES	Real History (Review)	479
DOBB, MAURICE	The International Economic Conference	266
DUTT, CLEMENS	War Moves Over the Middle East	21
	Soviet Genetics (Review)	141
DUTT, R. PALME	Notes of the Month: Peace or War in 1952?	1
	Notes of the Month: Churchill's Canossa	49
	Notes of the Month: Balance-Sheet of War or Thoughts for Budget Day	97
	Notes of the Month: Easter Congress Signposts	145
	Notes of the Month: Labour, Mr. Bevan and Britain's Future	193
	Notes of the Month: Rising of the Storm	241
	Notes of the Month: Trade Unions and Rearmament	289
	Notes of the Month: Morecambe-Margate-Moscow	433
	Notes of the Month: New Horizons	481
	Notes of the Month: Eisenhower and Britain	529
C.P.D.	Shorter Notice (Marx-Engels-Marxism)	96
	Marxist Textbook (Review)	239
M.D.	Chess (Review)	286
	Shorter Notice (Marx and Science)	288
	East-West Trade	527
EATON, JOHN	The Empire Conference	518
ELLIOTT, LON	Godwin and Others (Review)	44
EVANS, REV. STANLEY	Lisbon and After	177
FARRINGTON, BENJAMIN	A New Journal (Review)	287
	The New Chinese People	448
FRANCIS, RONALD	World Slump Signs?	320
GALLACHER, WILLIAM	The Struggle in Australia	410
	Down Under (Review)	427
	History of the C.P. U.S.A. (Review)	569
GARDNER, JIM	Trades Union Congress, 1952	396
GHOSH, AJOY	General Elections in India	226
GOLLAN, JOHN	The New Fabians	337
GUTTUSO	Peasants of Sicily—Drawings	408-409
W.G.	'I Work for my Bread' (Review)	526
HAMMOND, J.	Chartism (Review)	332
HANNAFORD, NICHOLAS	Avicenna	325
HANNINGTON, WAL	Storm Warning For Trade Unionists	111
HARDY, GEORGE	China's Feet Unbound (Review)	477
HILTON, RODNEY	Middle Ages (Review)	335
HOGARTH, PAUL	Original Drawings	72-73
	Drawings of Greece	552, 553
HORNER, JOHN	Margate T.U.C.	450
HOWARTH, H.	The Engineer's Fight	317
JACKSON, FRANK	Ragged-Trousered Philanthropists (Review)	43
JOHNSON, DR. HEWLETT	The Speech at Peking	357
KERRIGAN, PETER	East-West Sport (Review)	46
KOTANE, MOSES	South African Fascism	369
KLUGMANN, JAMES	On the Road to Communism	497
LANGLAND, DAVID	Agriculture's Plight	87
LEONARDO DA VINCI	Extracts from The Notebooks of Leonardo Da Vinci, and Portrait	168-169
LLOYD, EDDIE	How We Began The Fight	159
T.Mc.W.	Korea (Review)	383
	Injured Innocence or The Biter Bit (Review)	478

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Page
MALCOLM, R.	U.S.S.R. Visit (Review)	94
	Genocide (Review)	524
MARX, KARL	Nationalisation of Land	415
MARX-AVELING, ELEANOR	See William Morris	
MASEREEL, FRANS	Lithograph	312-313, 360-361
MEEK, R. L.	The Making of a Great Idea (Review)	187
	The Man Who Was Haunted By Marx (Review Article)	424
MOFFAT, ABE	The Miners' New Fight	546
MONTAGU, IVOR	Cold Christmas Carol	66
	Meeting in Vienna	551
MORRIS, WILLIAM	Peace Manifesto of 1877	236
(with Eleanor Marx & others)	Manifesto of the Socialist League on the Sudan War	303
I.M.	Multum in Parvo (Review)	143
R.M.	Shorter Notice (The Last Optimist)	190
'OBSERVER'	Communication (Telengana)	331
	The Rosenberg Case	563
PEARSON, WILLIAM	Trade Unions—Alert	29
PERI, PETER	Engraving 'Korea'	256
POLLITT, HARRY	Year of Decision	15
	A Policy For Labour	385
PRITT, D. N., Q.C.,	Through Error to Truth (Review Article)	40
	The B.B.C. Throws Off The Mask	63
	The Press and Germ Warfare	212
	French Lessons: The Duclos Case	351
	What of our Independence?	541
PURCELL, HENRY	Trade: Free or Bond?	164
	Germany: Peace or War?	402
QUAESTOR	Germany and Peace	219
	The Crime at Bonn	307
	West German Focus of War	460
A.R.	Shorter Notice (U.S.S.R.)	430
SANDISON, GORDON	'Fire! Fire!' (Review)	189
SAVILLE, JOHN	Capital Holdings (Review)	92
SCHAFFER, GORDON	White Book (Review)	139
SCOTT, J. R.,	Engineers in The Front Line	512
SINGH, IQBAL	An Indian Childhood (Review)	239
SLOAN, PAT	Bulwark of Peace (Review)	45
STALIN, J. V.	On an Article by Engels	364
STEWART, NEIL	U.S. 'Cops and Robbers'	465
STRUTHERS, JOHN	Burma on The March (With Map)	182
THOMPSON, E. A.	Shorter Notice (Justinian)	190
THOMPSON, J. B.	Education Epic (Review)	428
	Glasgow Boys (Review)	527
TUCKETT, ANGELA	Readers' News, Fund and Circulation	See inside covers
	Freedom and Science (Review)	286
TURNER, R. T. F.	Blueprint for Prosperity	504-505
	Cover designs, maps, etc.	see covers
A.T.	Shorter Notice (Public Order)	480
WEST, ALICK	Shorter Notice (Lukàcs and Socialist Realism)	288
WINTERTON, E. M.	Fresh Currents in British Politics	346
	The Morecambe Conference	506
A.W.	Shorter Notice (Josiah Sage)	95
YEN, CHIU	Joining the Parade (Paper Cut)	456
	Picking Fruits (Paper Cut)	457
YOUNG, E. P., Commander, R.N. (Retired)	Atomic Strategy and The Admiralty	257

II—SUBJECTS

AGRICULTURE	Agriculture's Plight	87
AUSTRALIA	The Struggle in Australia	410
	Down Under (Review)	427
AVICENNA	Centenary Article	325
BRITISH BROADCASTING CORPORATION	The B.B.C. Throws Off The Mask	63
BEVERIDGE PLAN	Wisdom of the Month (Quotation)	74
BRITISH PRESS	Asylum 1852-1952 (Reprinted from *The Times*)	116
	The Press and Germ Warfare	212
BRITISH POLITICS	Atomic Strategy and The Admiralty	257
	Fresh Currents in British Politics	346
	What of our Independence?	541
BURMA	Burma on the March (With Map)	182
CHARTISM	Book Review	332
CHINA	'Mother China'	75, 131
	Plotting War on China	122
	The Speech at Peking	357
	The New Chinese People	448
COLD WAR	Cold Christmas Carol	66
CO-OPERATIVES	The Co-ops (Review)	91

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Page
ECONOMICS	Year of Decision	15
	Whose Crisis?	127
	Trade: Free or Bond?	164
	The Making of a Great Idea (Review)	187
	The International Economic Conference	266
	World Slump Signs	320
	The Man Who was Haunted by Marx	424
	The Empire Conference	518
EGYPT	The Coup D'Etat in Egypt	418
FRANCE	French Lessons: The Duclos Case	351
GENETICS	Soviet Genetics (Book Review)	141
GERMANY	Germany and Peace	219
	The Crime at Bonn	307
	Germany: Peace or War?	402
	West German Focus of War	460
HUGO, VICTOR	A Letter to The Queen	376
ILLUSTRATIONS	Original Drawings by Paul Hogarth	72-73
	Portrait of Leonardo da Vinci	168-169
	Lino-cut by Chittaprasad	216-217
	Engraving 'Korea' by Peter Peri	256
	Lithographs 'Destiny'	312-313, 360-361
	Peasants of Sicily (Drawings)	408-409
	Paper Cuts from New China	456-457
	Charts—Blueprint For Prosperity	504-505
	Maps	24-25, 120-121, 183
	Drawings of Greece by Paul Hogarth	552-553
INDIA	Indian Elections	117
	General Elections in India	226
	Telengana	331
INDONESIA	Indonesia	556
JORDAN	A Trial in Jordan	315
KENYA	Nineteen Years Ago	562
LABOUR MONTHLY	Progress Report (Editorial Board Statement)	264-265
LABOUR PARTY	The New Fabians	337
	A Policy for Labour	385
	The Morecambe Conference	506
LEONARDO DA VINCI	Centenary Article	170
MALAYA	The War in Malaya	33
MIDDLE EAST	War Moves Over The Middle East	21
MORRIS, WILLIAM	Peace Manifesto	236
	Manifesto of the Socialist League on the Sudan War	303
NATIONALISATION OF LAND	Article by Karl Marx	415
NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANISATION	Lisbon and After	177
PEACE	Through Error to Truth (Review Article)	40
	Meeting in Vienna	551
POETRY	The Accused	432
OBITUARIES	Joseph Winternitz, Sir George Young	238, 517
ROBINS, RAYMOND	A Witch-Hunt Victim	135
RICARDO, DAVID	Review Article	278
SOUTH AFRICA	South African Fascism	369
TRADE UNIONISM	Trade Unions—Alert	29
	Storm Warning For Trade Unionists	111
	How We Began The Fight	159
	The Miners' Fight	275
	The Engineers' Fight	317
	Trades Union Congress 1952	396
	Margate T.U.C.	450
	Engineers in the Front Line	512
	The Miners' New Fight	546
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO		14, 62, 115, 191, 235, 274, 330, 384, 431, 475, 523
UNITED STATES	Truman's Point IV	81
	US. 'Cops and Robbers'	465
	The Rosenberg Case	563
	History of the C.P. U.S.A. (Review)	569
U.S.S.R.	On an Article by Engels	364
	The Soviet Union Today (Review)	430
	On the Road to Communism	497
VAPTSAROV, NIKOLA	An Appreciation	471

Books Reviewed

Author or Editor	Title (and Reviewer)	Page
American Friends Service Committee	**Steps to Peace, A Quaker View of U.S. Foreign Policy** (D. N. Pritt, Q.C.)	40
Anand, Mulk Raj	**Seven Summers** (Iqbal Singh)	239
Ball, F. C.	**Tressell of Mugsborough** (Frank Jackson)	43
Bernal, J. D., F.R.S.	**Disarmament** (B.M.B.)	191
	Marx and Science (C.P.D.)	288
Blackman, Peter	**My Song is for All Men** (W.G.)	526

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Page
Burchett, W. G.	**China's Feet Unbound** (G. Hardy)	477
Chinese Books	(John Chinnery)	240
Civil Rights Congress, N.Y.	**We Charge Genocide** (R. Malcolm)	524
Cole, G. D. H.	**The British Co-operative Movement in a Socialist Society** (Elinor Burns)	91
Cornforth, Maurice	**Dialectical Materialism** (C.P.D.)	239
Delegation of Trade Unionists to the U.S.S.R.	**Russia—The Truth** (R. Malcolm)	94
Evans, Rev. Stanley	**East of Stettin-Trieste** (B.M.B.)	430
Ferguson, T., and J. Cunnison	**The Young Wage-Earner—A Study of Glasgow Boys** (Joan B. Thompson)	527
Ferguson, T.	**The Young Delinquent in His Social Setting** (Joan B. Thompson)	527
Finkelstein, S.	**How Music Expresses Ideas** (Rutland Boughton)	476
Fleisher, David	**William Godwin: A Study in Liberalism** (Lon Elliott)	44
Follows, John W.	**Antecedents of the International Labour Organisation** (Lon Elliott)	44
Foster, W. Z.	**History of the Communist Party of the U.S.** (W. Gallacher)	569
Hatch, John	**The Dilemma of South Africa** (R. Malcolm)	524
Hardy, Frank	**Power Without Glory** (W. Gallacher)	427
Hutt, G. A.	**British Trade Unionism** (J. Davidson)	479
Karlsen, H.	**Recent Trends in the Law of the United Nations** (Ivor Montagu)	143
Keech, A. G.	**Public Order** (A.T.)	480
Lattimore, O.	**Ordeal by Slander** (T.Mc.W.)	478
Lenin, V. I.	**Marx-Engels-Marxism** (C.P.D.)	96
Makarenko, A. S	**The Road to Life** (J. B. Thompson)	428
Manton, S. M.	**The Soviet Union Today** (A.R.)	430
Marx, Karl	**Theories of Surplus Value** (Ronald Meek)	187
Miscellany	**The Memoirs of Josiah Sage** (A.W.)	95
	Past and Present (Benjamin Farrington)	287
Montagu, Ivor	**East-West Sport Relations** (Peter Kerrigan)	46
Morton, A. G.	**Soviet Genetics** (Clemens Dutt)	141
Mowatt, Farley	**People of the Deer** (R. Malcolm)	524
Oakeshott, Michael	**Political Education**	48
Parkinson, Hargreaves	**Ownership of Industry** (John Saville)	92
Pritt, D. N., Q.C.	**Russia is for Peace** (Pat Sloan)	45
Radford, F. H.	**Fetch the Engine** (Gordon Sandison)	189
Revai, Jozsef	**Lukàcs and Socialist Realism** (Alick West)	288
Robinson, Joan	**Conference Sketchbook** (A.R.)	430
Safanov, V.	**Land in Bloom** (Angela Tuckett)	286
Saville, John	**Ernest Jones—Chartist** (J. Hammond)	332
Schumpeter, Joseph A.	**Ten Great Economists: From Marx to Keynes** (R. L. Meek)	424
Singh, Iqbal	**Report on Russia** (B.M.B.)	95
Sraffa, P. & Dobb, M.	**The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo edited by Piero Sraffa with collaboration of M. H. Dobb. Vols. I-V** (R. Page Arnot)	278
Stenton, D. M.	**English Society in the Early Middle Ages** (Rodney Hilton)	335
Stone, I. F.	**The Hidden History of The Korean War** (T.McW.)	383
Thompson, E. P.	**The Struggle For a Free Press** (B.M.B.)	480
Townshend-Rose, H.	**The British Coal Industry**	191
Ulam, Adam B.	**Philosophical Foundations of English Socialism** (Lon Elliott)	44
Ure, P. N.	**Justinian and His Age** (E. A. Thompson)	190
Vayo, Alvarez Del	**The Last Optimist** (R.M.)	190
White Book (Berlin)	**White Book on the American and British Policy Intervention in West Germany** (Gordon Schaffer)	139
Winter, W., & Wade, R. G.	**World Chess Championship** (C.P.D.)	286

WANTED . . . .

Library seeks to complete files by buying odd copies of following Soviet periodicals for 1952: Novoe Vremya; Ogonek; Izvestiya; Akad Nauk; Lesnaya promyshlennost; Leanoe khozyaystvo; Molochnaya Promyshlennost; Myasnaya Industriya; Nauka i zhizn; Oktyabr; Selkhozmashina; Professionalnye soyuzy; Spvetskaya Pedagogica; Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo; Soviet Union; Tekstilnaya promyshlennost; Torfyanaya promyshlennost; Vestnik Akad; Nauk. Offers please to Box S, c/o Bartlett's, 31, Museum Street, London, W.C.1.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley. Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

price is 25s., with the usual concession of exchanging complete loose sets on payment of 10s. 6d. only. As an encouragement to those Bound Volume enthusiasts for whom even this sum is difficult to find, we will bind their copies *free* if they win three annual *new* subscriptions, or six *new* half-yearly subscriptions before December 31. But in any event, order early.

This is the time for remembering friends. Such as these—a richly varied collection, for it takes all sorts to make a new world:
The London Gasworkers. Each month a gasworker buys *L.M.* Three mates pay him 4d. when it comes to them, taking it in turn to keep the copy. None can afford a subscription; equally none can afford to be without it. *A cartoonist*: 'Excellent graphs of Soviet production, which I've been trying to work out for years in that form. No criticism during '52. Keep it bright for '53.' *Unemployed Worker*: 'Here's my sub. But no donation; have been out of work four months. Never was a high salaried worker.' *A Serviceman*: 'You won't have any illusions as to how we servicemen are off financially. I can't buy more than a month at a time. But I'm taking out a year's subscription when I'm demobbed in the spring'. *A Railwayman*: 'Shall always try to manage something as donation, however small. We can't do without *L.M.* in these difficult times'. *An ex-Policeman*: 'It's more to me than 18s. a year. My one regret is that I can't afford more. Good luck to all engaged on it. Without it we should be in the hell of a hole for real news and comment'. *An engineer*: 'Sorry! No bonus for you this year. Can't look far enough ahead'. *A clergyman*: 'Here's a small contribution. May the dawn soon break over Britain'. *A Pensioner*: 'With my sub. renewal, 2s. donation—all I can afford with my dependance on a pension'. *A Sea-going Engineer*, now pensioner: 'No doubt about renewing my sub. I've saved that £1 for nine months, and hope to pay for a few more years too. Keep the 2s. change'.

Some pence speak louder than pounds. Many of them made our October fund total

£58 13s. 2d.

STAND-IN MONEY came from: **'Billie'**, standing-in for Tonypandy 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s.; F.C. (U.S.A.), standing-in for Willingdon (pre-paid); 'Exeter', standing-in for Birmingham, Coventry, Crediton, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Southampton, Stafford, Turton (Lancs.) and Weymouth (pre-paid).

STEADY MONEY came from: Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s.; 'Leicester', 5s.; 'Norwich, fed up with Exeter standing-in for us', 2s.; K. & J.E., 'East Edinburgh', £1; C.B. 'Bristol', 3s.; J.H., 'Ipswich', 5s.; 'Chicago', 14s. 2d.; J.F., 'Aberdeen', (pre-paid); A.G., 'Arbroath', (pre-paid); 'New York', (pre-paid); P.O'H., 'Dublin' (pre-paid); 'Exeter' (pre-paid); 'Red Sergeant', 2s. 6d.; 'Socialist Sailor', £2; D.G. & P.W., £5; E. D. McCallum (pre-paid); H.G.B., 2s.; R.F.B., £3; Q. Elliot, 6s.; D. M. Clarke, 10s ; T. Flood, 2s. 6d.; E.J.B., £1; D. H. Strathern & Friends, 5s.; M. Phillibert, 12s.; Royston Green, 3s. 6d.; H. Tinkler, 5s.; The Humphreys Family, 4s.; 'L'Humanité', 3s.; S. Morrissy, 10s.; 'Jon', 2s.; 'Cambridge Seniors', £3 15s.; F. Renouf, 5s.; Olivia Greene, £2; R. McLeod, 10s.; D. Rees, 10s.; D.M., 6s.; P. N. Brinson, 10s.; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d.

Other contributions include: R. P. Neal, 2s.; G. Cameron, 7s.; J. V. Ruffell, 12s.; W. A. Burbridge, 2s.; J. Walls, 2s.; A. Wynne, 7s.; C. D. Say, 4s.; J. R. Smith, 5s.; 'A Stalwart', £1 16s. 6d.; T. Grounds, £1 1s.; W.W., £1 2s.; C. Penn, 12s.; H. J. Hooper, 2s.; J. G. Steel, 2s.; J. Walkinshaw, 10s.; T. Russell, 2s.; M. W. Elliott, 2s.; A.A.H. (South Africa), 16s. 6d.; J. Smith, 2s. 6d.; F.B., 3s. 6d.; J. Mackenzie, 2s.; B.P., 2s.; J. L. Smith, 5s.; M. Mertens-Stienon, 7s.; H. M. Barnett, 12s.; N. Ratcliffe, 5s.; A. J. Horn, 2s.; L. Blott, 12s.; W. Simenauer, 2s.; G. Gillingham, 2s.; A. C. Rendell, 2s.; B Farrington, 12s.; A. Dickson, 7s.; S. Harrison, 7s.; S. Lawther, 2s.; R. Weare, 12s.; D. A. Hamilton, 7s.; E. J. Gillett, 2s.; Dr. D.B., 18s.; J. Conway, £9 12s.; T. Crawford, 3s.; J. A. P. Hall, 1s. 6d.; L. Green, 2s.; R. C. Champion, 3s.; H. F. Ludford, 12s.; 'Ardent Co-operators', £2 10s.; H.W.L. (U.S.A.), £1 1s.; W.L.G. (U.S.A.), 7s. 1d.; A.S.L. (U.S.A.), £3 10s. 5d.; R.B. (U.S.A.), 10s. 7d.; L.F.P. (U.S.A.), 3s. 5d.; A. Macmillan, 2s.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT

Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour Monthly Bound Volume 1952

It's a history of the year and a permanent record

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents price **£1 5s. 0d.**

Or send **10s. 6d.** and your loose copies by **December 15th** to

THE MANAGER
134 BALLARDS LANE
LONDON, N.3

Ready end of January

SCIENCE & SOCIETY

ESTABLISHED 1936

Volume XVI, Number 4
Fall, 1952

SCIENTISTS AND WORLD TENSION *C. F. Powell* (Nobel Prize Winner)

PRINCIPLES of RATIONAL PSYCHOTHERAPY *Zalman Behr*

THE TRANSITION FROM FEUDALISM TO CAPITALISM *H. K. Takahashi*

Quarterly, 50 cents single copy
$2.00 per year ($2.50 foreign)

SCIENCE & SOCIETY, Inc.
30 East 20th St., New York 3, N.Y.

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly

Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement

Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

Annual Subscription 24s.

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1.

LABOUR RESEARCH

December issue includes :
"Wages"
"Kenya : the Background"
"Profits—Have They Vanished?"
"Building Costs and Profits"

Monthly 9d. ; p.a., 10s. 6d.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy to:—

(1) Name .....

Address .....

(2) Name .....

Address .....

You may mention my name, or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed.....

Address .....

.....

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED